

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
ALLEN, D. C.—Milton and the Sons of God,	73
STEVENSON, A. H.—Shirley's Dedications and the Date of His Return to England,	79
BENNETT, J. A. W.—The Early Fame of Gavin Douglas's 'Eneados,'	83
HANKINS, J. E.—Lear and the Psalmist,	88
CHRISTIAN, MILDRED G.—Middleton's Residence at Oxford,	90
BLED SOE, T. F.—On Poe's "Valley of Unrest,"	91
CHACE, FLORENCE MACDERMID.—A Note on Whitman's Mockingbird,	93
CLARK, R. T., JR.—Hamann's Opinion of Herder's 'Ursachen des gesunkenen Geschmacks,'	94
SCHIROKAUER, ARNO.—'Genczlichkeit,'	99
SPITZER, LEO.—Yiddisch '(t)schale(n)t' = französisch 'chaud' ?	101
SPITZER, LEO.—'Turiupin,'	104
SINGLETON, C. S.—The Use of Latin in the 'Vita Nuova,'	108
FRANK, GRACE.—Villon's Adversary,	113
LOSS, H.—An Analogue of 'L'Ermite' in 'Zadig,'	115
BIRD, C. W.—Stendhal's "Baltimore Incident." A Correction,	118
BIRD, C. W.—The Origin of the Name "Rarahu,"	120
TALAMON, RENÉ.—Curel et Rostand,	121
LIVINGSTON, C. H.—Old French 'seille' 'bucket,'	123

REVIEWS:—

A. J. F. ZIEGLESCHMID (ed.), <i>Die älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder.</i> [Arno Schirokauer.]	124
Festschrift für M. Blakemore Evans. [Arno Schirokauer.]	129
GEORG MINDE-POUET (ed.), <i>Goedeke's Grundriß zur Geschichte der deut- schen Dichtung.</i> [J. O. Blankenagel.]	130
A. C. JUDSON, <i>The Life of Edmund Spenser.</i> [Douglas Bush.]	132
VERNON HALL, JR., <i>Renaissance Literary Criticism.</i> [F. M. Krouse.] . . .	135
HELEN W. RANDALL, <i>The Critical Theory of Lord Kames.</i> [Gordon McKenzie.]	137
G. C. D. ODELL, <i>Annals of the New York Stage. Vol. XIV.</i> [A. H. Quinn.] .	138
E. L. TURNBULL (tr.), <i>Contemporary Spanish Poetry: Selections from Ten Poets;</i> C. M. LANCASTER and P. T. MANCHESTER (trs.), <i>The Araucaniad.</i> [Gustavo Correa.]	139
H. R. HUSE, <i>Reading and Speaking Foreign Languages.</i> [H. C. Lancaster.] .	141
BRIEF MENTION: E. D. SEEGER et H. H. H. REMAK (eds.), <i>Œuvres de Charles-Michel Campion;</i> A. G. KENNEDY, <i>A Concise Bibliography for Students of English,</i>	142
CORRESPONDENCE: <i>The Manuel des Pêchés;</i> Mrs. Gordon Smythies,	144

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

C. S. SINGLETON

CHARLES R. ANDERSON

DON CAMERON ALLEN

Advisory Editors

E. Feise, Grace Frank, J. C. French, E. Malakis, R. B. Roulston, Pedro Salinas, L. Spitzer

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00 for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNE.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLE.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore 18, Maryland.

A GENERAL INDEX

TO VOLUMES FIFTY-ONE TO SIXTY OF

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

1936-1945

Compiled by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER and H. H. SHAPIRO is now published. The Index is divided into three parts: Subjects, Authors of Articles and of Books Reviewed; and Reviewers.

viii + 136 pages, 8vo, paper \$2.75

The General Index to Volumes One to Fifty published in 1935, priced \$5.00, is still obtainable.

Orders may be sent to the publisher

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE 18

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103,
Act of Congress of July 16, 1894.

Modern Language Notes

Volume LXI

FEBRUARY, 1946

Number 2

MILTON AND THE SONS OF GOD

In the eleventh book of *Paradise Lost*, Adam, seated on the eminence of prophecy, surveys a fat plain, flourishing with industry and arts.

After these,
But on the hither side, a different sort
From the high neighbouring hills, which was their seat,
Down to the plain descended: by their guise
Just men they seemed, and all their study bent
To worship God aright, and know his works
Not hid; nor those things last which might preserve
Freedom and peace to men. They on the plain
Long had not walked, when from the tents behold
A bevy of fair women, richly gay
In gems and wanton dress! to the harp they sung
Soft amorous ditties, and in dance came on.
The men, though grave, eyed them, and let their eyes
Rove without rein, till, in the amorous net
Fast caught, they liked, and each his liking chose. (573-87)

With this scene Adam is delighted, for he sees in it a harbinger of "peaceful days"; but not so Michael, the stern exegete of the vision. These, says the angel, are the children of wickedness, women without "domestic honor," for whose sake the sons of God have yielded up their virtue. This is Milton's longest account of this Biblical episode, and it is clear that here the sons of God are pious men who mismate with the daughters of him "who slew his brother." But there is another interpretation.¹

In *Paradise Regained*, Belial encourages Satan to tempt Christ

¹ In *PL*, III, 461-3, we find a reference to the giants born of "ill-joined sons and daughters." Some commentaries seem to read this with the line before about "middle spirits," but I see no syntactical reason for this. To my notion, these lines add nothing to our knowledge of Milton's theories.

by setting "women in his eye and in his walk." Satan points out that Belial is inclined to attribute his personal weaknesses to everyone else.

Before the flood thou with thy lusty crew
False titled sons of God, roaming the earth
Cast wanton eyes on the daughters of men,
And coupled with them, and begot a race. (II, 178-81)

Here, the sons of God—false titled as their leader says—are clearly either fallen angels or demons.

Since the time of Newton, the commentators on Milton have explained these passages by observing that the ancients identified the sons of God either with the descendants of Seth or with angels. I wish to expand this commentary, to make it more precise, to indicate the artistic method of Milton and the mood of his age.

The essential source is, of course, Genesis 6:2—"That the sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair." The crux of the passage lies on the phrase "sons of God." The Vulgate renders it "filii Dei" and the Hebrew has בְּנֵי־אֱלֹהִים (sons of the gods), but the Chaldaic paraphrase has בְּנֵי־רַבְרִיָּא (sons of the mighty, of princes) and the LXX reads οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ (angels of God). On these various readings are grounded many interpretations.

All of the exegetes refer eventually to three authorities: to Josephus, who relates the backslidings of the sons of Seth, but who says that the antediluvian giants were begotten on mortal women by angels;² to Philo, who states that it was Moses' custom to write *angel* for those spirits that the ethnic philosophers call *demons*;³ and to Eusebius, who follows the Septuagint version in his remarks on the Titans.⁴ The earlier writers follow this trend of thought. Justin says that the angels disobeyed their mandate and cohabited with women;⁵ Irenaeus thinks that all the angelic hybrids perished in the Flood;⁶ Cyprian,⁷ Athenagoras,⁸ and Lactantius⁹ relate

² *Antiquities*, I. 3. 1. ³ *Giants*, 6-8. ⁴ *Preparatio evangelica*, 186c.

⁵ ΕΡΩΤΗΣΕΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΙΚΑΙ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΟΥΣ ΕΛΛΗΝΑΣ, PG., VI, col. 1452.

⁶ ΕΛΕΓΧΟΤ ΚΑΙ ΑΝΑΤΡΟΠΗΣ ΤΗΣ ΨΕΥΔΟΝΤΜΟΤ ΓΝΩΣΕΩΣ, PG., VII, col. 1093.

⁷ *De singularitate clericorum*, *Opera omnia* (Hartel, Vienna, 1876), III, 204.

⁸ ΠΡΕΣΒΕΙΑ ΠΕΡΙ ΧΡΙΣΤΙΑΝΩΝ, PG., VI, col. 947.

⁹ *De origine erroris*, PL., VI, cols. 330-1.

that the tutelar angels sent to instruct men succumbed to the beauty of women. Clemens of Alexandria, alone, defers to the hint of Josephus.

All things, therefore, being finished that are in the heaven and the earth and the waters, and human beings having increased in the eighth generation, pious men, who lived the life of angels, being attracted by the beauty of women, fell into libidinous and unlawful relations with them; and hereafter acting in all things without discretion and order, they altered the state of human affairs and the divinely arranged condition of life, so that either by persuasion or force they made all men sin against their creator God.¹⁰

The doctrine of Clemens was emphasized in the great patristic age. Cyrillus of Alexandria,¹¹ Chrysostom,¹² and Procopius of Gaza¹³ insisted that the sons of God were the sons of Seth who sinned with the daughters of Cain. To this cloud of witnesses, Augustine adds his authority and argues that it is biologically impossible for angels to breed with men.¹⁴ He is not so sure that sylvan spirits and fauns (*silvani et fauni*) are incapable of breeding with women, but he is very certain that the sons of God are the sons of Seth.¹⁵

The Middle Ages followed the dogma of Augustine. Aquinas accepts his position; and says that if the giants were begotten by demons, it was by means of human seed, which was acquired in a succubus manifestation and transmitted in incubus form.¹⁶ The first modern exegete of that age, Nicolas of Lyra, rejects the doctrine of the angelic intermarriage and of the princely miscegenation because the sons of Seth notion is more rational.¹⁷ Another late mediaeval commentator of merit, Alfonso Tostado, agreed with him.¹⁸ The Renaissance accepted this opinion and was very emphatic in rejecting the others.

¹⁰ *Recognitiones*, PG., I, cols. 1223-4.

¹¹ ΓΛΑΦΤΡΩΝ ΕΙΣ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ, PG., LXXIX, cols. 51-2 and ΗΡΟΣ ΤΑ ΤΟΤ ΕΝ ΑΘΕΟΙΣ ΙΟΤΑΙΑΝΟΤ, PG., LXXVI, col. 945. Julian quite clearly subscribed to the angel theory.

¹² *Homiliae in Genesin*, PG., LIII, cols. 187-9.

¹³ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΓΕΝΕΣΙΝ ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ, PG., LXXXVII, cols. 266-7.

¹⁴ *Quaestiones in Heptateuchum*, PL., XXXIV, col. 549.

¹⁵ *De civitate Dei* (Leipzig, 1825), II, 70-3.

¹⁶ *Summa theologiae*, LI. 3. 6.

¹⁷ *Biblia* (Basel, 1498), *in loc.*

¹⁸ *Opera* (Venice, 1728), I, 125.

Both Luther and Calvin define the sons of God as men of piety who were seduced by the impious. Luther, though he admits the possibility that demons can take human form, says that they are unable to breed with women. "Sed quod ex Diabolo et homine possit aliquid generari, hoc simpliciter falsum est."¹⁹ Calvin thinks that this notion and that of social mismating are equally absurd.²⁰ The other exegetes followed this lead and held that to translate the sons of God as either angels or demons was unorthodox.²¹

This was the state of the controversy in Milton's age, and we can now understand why the unorthodox interpretation was placed in the mouth of Satan and the accepted interpretation made the basic motif of Adam's vision. Satan's remark is artistically suited to the greatest of heretics.

The importance for Milton of the orthodox account does not, however, end here. The passage in the eleventh book informs us that the sons of Seth lived on a hill, whereas the sons of Cain—who were herders, musicians, metalsmiths, and miners and whose daughters were professional singers, dancers, dress-designers, cosmeticians, and seducers of men—lived in the surrounding plain. This is not Genesis although a hint of it can be found in the fifth chapter of that book. Professor McColley sees, and quite rightly so, the source of this material in the apocryphal *Book of Enoch*.²² Unfortunately, however, the *Book of Enoch* was not found until 1773;

¹⁹ *In primum librum Mose enarrationes, Exegetica opera latina* (Erlangen, 1829), III, 126-8.

²⁰ *Commentariorum in quinque libros Mosis, Opera* (Brunswick, 1882), XXII, cols. 111-2.

²¹ William Hamer, *Commentationes in Genesim* (Dillingen, 1564), I, 61r-v; Polycarp Lyser, *Noachus* (Leipzig, 1605), p. 9; John Piscator, *Quaestiones in Pentateuchum* (Herborn, 1624), pp. 52-3; John Lightfoot, *A chronicle of the times and the order of the texts of the Old Testament, The Whole Works* (Pitman, London, 1822), II, 78. Jean Mercier holds that the demon and angel theory is absurd, but leans towards the notion of the sons of princes. *In Genesim* (Geneva, 1598), pp. 143-4. Peter Martyr is undecided between this view and the sons of Seth. *In Primum librum Mosis, qui vulgo Genesis dicitur, comentarii* (Zurich, 1579), p. 27. A few commentators like Cornelius à Lapide offer all the interpretations without indicating a choice. *Commentarium in Pentateuchum Mosis liber* (Antwerp, 1616), in loc.

²² "The *Book of Enoch* and *Paradise Lost*," *The Harvard Theological Review*, XXXI (1938), pp. 31-3.

and though McColley knows this, he argues from the accounts of its inclusion in fabulous libraries of the Near East described by Purchas, Sandys, and others that Milton had somehow or other put his hands on a copy. If Milton did find such a manuscript, he promptly burned it. It was a work unknown to the great orientalists of his day. Hottinger has not seen it; it is known to Bochart only through Clemens of Alexandria; and as late as 1713, it is unknown to J. A. Fabricius, the greatest of early bibliographers. McColley would have had a much better case if he had worked from the derivative writers, who are Syncellus, Cedranus, and Eutychius. I do not know which of these authorities Milton read for his account of the sons of Seth. Perhaps he read them all—so much the better.

The fragments of *The Book of Enoch* in the Greek text of Syncellus are to be found in Scaliger's edition of Eusebius published at Leyden in 1606; they were not available in Latin translation until 1670 when August Pfeiffer appended a translation to his commentary on Obadiah. The *Συναγωγὴ ἱστοριῶν* of Georgius Cedranus could be had in the Basel edition of 1566 or the Paris edition of 1647. From Syncellus, Milton could have learned that the *Εγγρηγοροὶ* voted to take wives from the daughters of men. Their chief, Semiazas, swore them all to an oath so that they would sin together. "They were to the number of two hundred, who in the days of Jared descended on Mount Hermon." They took wives in A. O. C. 1170 and begot giants on them and taught them charms and enchantments. Subsequently, Azazel or Azael, one of the twenty leaders, instructed them in metal working, tinctures, and the use of precious stones.²³ It is very clear in this passage that the *Εγγρηγοροὶ* are not the sons of Seth, but angels who descend on Mount Hebron. Cedranus tells a variant story.

Cedranus, who derives either from the *Book of Enoch* or from some other derivatives, is far closer to Milton. In the fortieth year of Jared, he writes, the *Εγγρηγοροὶ*, children of Seth, came down and took unto themselves for wives the daughters of men. Then, he begins his narrative again with "These on Mount Hermon resolved to select wives from the daughters of men or the race of Cain," and continues with the account we find in Syncellus about their arts and crafts and the instruction given by Azael. Cedranus thinks of

²³ I am following the text of Scaliger as reprinted in J. A. Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigraphus veteris testamenti* (Hamburg, 1722), I, 179-84.

the *Εγγρηγοροι* as men not as angels.²⁴ But a much better source, in some respects, is Eutychius.

Eutychius, whose Arab name was Saïd-ibn-Batrik, wrote in the ninth century a work called *Nathm-el-Gauhar* (*A String of Jewels*); the Arabic text of this work with a Latin version was printed at Oxford in 1658 by Edward Pococke, Professor of Hebrew and Arabic. A selection from this work with full critical apparatus was issued as early as 1642 by John Selden with the title *Ecclesiae suae Origines*. Eutychius certainly knew the *Book of Enoch*, *The Book of Adam and Eve*, and similar works; and I rather think that Milton—thanks to Selden, Pococke, and the timeliness of the edition—knew Eutychius. Let the text speak for itself.

Coluerunt autem filii Sethi in isto monte puritatem et sanctimoniam, vocem angelorum, a quibus prope aberant, audientes, unaque cum ipsis Deum laudantes et celebrantes; appellatique sunt ipsi cum uxoribus et liberis suis, filii Dei. Neque erat ipsis opificium, nec seges, nec messis; sed victum praebebant arborum fructus: nec ullus apud ipsos locus invidiae, injustitiae, aut mendacio; juramentum ipsorum erat: Non, per sanguinem Abeli. . . Cumque jam appropinquaret Seth mors, filios suos per Abelis sanguinem adjuravit, neminem ex ipsis de monte isto sancto descensurum, nec permissuros se ut quispiam e liberis suis ad Kaino maledicto prognatos migraret. . . Natus est Kainan; cujus tempore conficiebant filii Kaini maledicti tympana, cymbala, barbita et instrumenta musica, primique ferrum et aes elaborabant, quaeque ex ipsis conficiuntur omnia tabernacula etiam fixerunt in quibus degerent. . . Quod ad posteros autem Kaini homicidae, adhinniebant viri mulieribus instar equorum, eodemque modo absque pudore viris feminae, scortantes, aliique cum aliis turpia patrantes, palamque congregientes, eadem cum femina virus duobus aut tribus rem habentibus, erantque vetulae juvenibus salaciores; patres cum filiabus, juvenes cum matribus suis venere promiscua utebantur, adeo ut nec liberi patres suos nec patres liberos dignoscerent, omnibus interim instrumentis musicis utebantur, adeo ut clamoris et lusus ipsorum sonus ad fastigium montis sancti ascenderet; quem cum audivissent Sethi posterii, convenerunt ex ipsis centum viri ut e monte ad posteros Kaini maledicti descenderent, quos juramento per sanguinem Abelis obstrinxerat Jared, ne de monte sancto descenderent. Ipsi tamen, dictum ejus nihil morati, descenderunt; cumque descendissent filias Kaini maledicti specie pulchras et sine pudore nudas conspicientes, cupidine exarserunt: eos similiter conspicientes Kaini filiae, viros specie pulchra, statura gigantea, ipsos ferarum instar insilientes corpora eorum inquinaverunt, atque ita cum filiabus Kaini scortando perierunt filii Sethi.²⁵

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, PG., CXXI, col. 44.

²⁵ *Contextio gemmarum sive . . . annales*, PG., CXI, cols. 911-3.

Eutychius provides the thread for Milton's weaving better than any of the other sources, better even than the *Book of Enoch*. The people on the mount are clearly the pious sons of Seth, not angels. The children of Cain discover the arts *before* the progeny of Seth descend from the mount. The sons of God are lured by the music and the artful nudity of the women. The other records are, however, not entirely out of the question; and I think that if McColley's good analogues with the *Book of Enoch* were searched in them, one would not have to force a non-existent manuscript into the poet's hands.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

SHIRLEY'S DEDICATIONS AND THE DATE OF HIS RETURN TO ENGLAND

Not long ago in this journal Mr. A. H. Carter argued that the dramatist James Shirley had returned from Ireland and was in London "late in 1639 or early in 1640,"¹ that is by March 24, 1639/40, the end of the legal year. I find, however, a flaw in his argument; and I wish to point out satisfactory evidence that Shirley returned not so early as March but rather in April 1640.

The flaw lies in the assumption that the dedication of *The Maides Revenge* (1639) was probably written in London, the place of publication. It is true that in the seventeenth century an author commonly furnished his dedication at the time his book was going through the press; yet there is good reason for thinking that Shirley transmitted the dedication of this play from Dublin to his publisher in London.

The Maides Revenge was one of seventeen or eighteen plays which Shirley published during the three years or so that he resided in Ireland.² This remarkable series of quartos appeared mainly under the combined imprint of Andrew Crooke and William Cooke, and seems to have been expedited by the presence of a Crooke book-

¹ Albert Howard Carter, "Shirley's Return to London in 1639-40," *MLN.*, LVIII (March 1943), 196-97.

² He had gone to Ireland probably in November 1636; see my article "Shirley's Years in Ireland," *RES.*, xx (January 1944), 19-22.

shop in Dublin.³ However, Cooke alone was the publisher of *The Maides Revenge*; he entered it on the Register April 12, 1639. When the play came from the press, dated "1639," it carried a dedication to "THE WORTHILY Honoured, Henry Osborne Esquire." Just who this Osborne was is uncertain, but Mr. Carter has made the excellent conjecture⁴ that he was Henry Osborne of Chicksands, elder brother of Dorothy Osborne and the ogre of her letters to William Temple.

Now, it is something of a coincidence that a Henry Osborne was staying at Wentworth's court in Dublin in the summer of 1639. Although the traces he left are few, they suggest a secretarial position under the Lord Deputy. The name "*Hen. Osborne*" appears three times in endorsements on letters forwarded from Dublin to Wentworth, who was at Naas, his country-seat. Two of the notations are dated July 24 and the third August 28, 1639.⁵ If this was Henry Osborne of Chicksands, I would guess that he had journeyed to Ireland with his cousin Sir Edward Osborne of Kiveton, whom Wentworth had urged to visit him that summer.⁶ Shirley, as the dramatist attached to Wentworth's court, would find young Henry full of news and perhaps interested in plays, and might indeed rue the day of his departure for England.

This is a flight of conjecture; but it sorts well with Shirley's remarks in the dedication of *The Maides Revenge*:

³ I have developed this idea in a recent paper on "Shirley's Publishers: the Partnership of Crooke and Cooke," *The Library*, 4th s., xxv (Dec. 1944-March 1945), 140-61.

⁴ In a letter to the writer. The present article has had the benefit of Mr. Carter's criticism.

⁵ *Strafforde's Letters and Dispatches*, ed. William Knowler (London, 1739), II, 372, 374, 378.

⁶ Sir Edward was Wentworth's deputy in the Presidency of the North. He was connected by marriage with the Osbornes of Chicksands (*The Letters of Dorothy Osborne to William Temple*, ed. G. C. Moore-Smith [Oxford, 1928], pp. 320-21), and later his son Thomas was a suitor for Dorothy's hand. Sir Edward secured permission from the King about July 13 "to attend my Lord Deputy in Ireland this summer" (Hist. MSS Comm., *Cowper MSS*, II [London, 1888], 235-37). If he took Henry with him, they may have stayed in Ireland seven weeks and then returned to England with Wentworth on September 12-13 (*Camden Miscellany*, IX [1895], 11), when the latter sailed to become the King's first minister. The evidence may lie in Strafford's unpublished letters at Wentworth Woodhouse or Henry Osborne's unpublished diary at Chicksands.

It is a Tragedy which received encouragement and grace on the English Stage . . . I never affected the wayes of flattery: some say I have lost my preferment, by not practising that Court sinne; but . . . I much honour you, nor is it upon guesse, but the taste and knowledge of your abilitie and merit; and while the Court wherein you live, is fruitfull with Testimonies of your mind, my Character is seal'd up, when I have said that your vertue hath taken up a faire lodging.

It is an epistle replete with tantalizing ambiguities, but some resolve themselves into meaning if we think of them as written from a distance. For Shirley speaks of "the Court wherein you live," not as a place he enjoys with his friend, but as if it were "a faire lodging" as far off as, say, London is from Dublin. Similarly, his reference to "the *English Stage*" gains point if we consider that he may be thinking of his career at the Cockpit as contrasted with his employment at Werburgh Street in Dublin; for if he were writing in London he could simply say "the Stage."⁷ *The Royall Master* (1638) offers a parallel in a dedication which he certainly wrote in Ireland. On inscribing a manuscript of this play, in 1637 just before sailing for a visit in England, Shirley observed that the play was "expected with the first, when the English Stage shall be recovered from her long silence [due to the plague]." Again, in the *Maides Revenge* dedication, the well-known ironic remark concerning the loss of preferment betrays perhaps an exile's wistfulness. And finally, Shirley's acquaintance with Osborne would seem to have been extensive and recent: the poet honors him not "upon guesse, but the taste and knowledge of [his] abilitie and merit"—words which in 1639 imply an acquaintance of some duration and one within the period of Shirley's residence in Ireland. Indeed, if Henry Osborne was Dorothy's brother, his youth itself would evidence a recent friendship; for Henry of Chicksands was but twenty in 1639.⁸

This theory, then, emerges. Sometime in 1639 William Cooke wrote Shirley that he had entered and was expecting to publish *The Maides Revenge*. Henry Osborne (perhaps of Chicksands) visited the Irish court in the summer and became Shirley's friend. He

⁷ As he does in London dedications; e. g., *The Wittie Faire One* (1633): "It wanted no grace on the Stage"; *The Young Admirall* (1637): "it hath bene gratefull to the stage"; *The Court Secret* (1653): "it happened to receive birth, when the Stage was interdicted."

⁸ *Letters*, ed. Moore-Smith, p. 320.

returned to England in the fall and resided at Westminster. At an uncertain time between August 1639 and March 1639/40 Shirley honored him with a dedication and sent it to Cooke for insertion in the quarto which Cotes would shortly bring from the press. . . . Unfortunately this reconstruction does not suggest the time of Shirley's own return to London. But two other dedications do.

Loves Crueltie is one of a group of five plays which were entered by Crooke and Cooke on April 25, 1639 and reached the presses of Thomas Cotes along side, or but shortly after, *The Maides Revenge*.⁹ Its dedication, to George and Charles Porter, sons of Endymion Porter, is odd in that it is signed "W. A." This W. A., who may have been William Allen the actor¹⁰ or Will Atkins of Gray's Inn,¹¹ was presumably handling the poet's business until the latter arrived in London. As the imprint is dated 1640, we have the inference that he was not yet in London at the commencement of that (legal) year, that is, by March 25, 1640;¹² for if the dramatist were in town surely he would provide his own dedication.

It is the dedication of *The Opportunitie* that provides the clue to the precise time of Shirley's return to England. This play, dated 1640, he inscribed to his friend Captain Richard Owen "at my returne with you, from another Kingdome." In a recent article¹³ I have traced this Owen's adventures in the Irish seas as captain of the *Ninth Whelp*, a guard-ship, up through April-May 1640, when he played a perilous part in incidents leading to the second Scottish war. On or about March 24, 1639/40 Strafford and his council in Dublin voted measures against Scotland, in pursuance of which Owen was ordered to be ready to patrol Scottish waters from April 8.¹⁴ Then on the 11th Strafford sent directions from Chester that Owen was to proceed at once from Dublin to Chester

* The others are *Wit without Money* (dated 1639), *The Night-Walker* (1640), *The Coronation* (1640), and *The Opportunitie* (1640). These with *The Maides Revenge* and *The Humorous Courtier* (Cooke, 1640) form a single bibliographical family.

¹⁰ See my article on "James Shirley and the Actors at the First Irish Theater," *MP*, XL (November 1942), 157.

¹¹ The writer of friendly commendatory verses for *The Traytor* in 1635—Shirley being also of Gray's Inn.

¹² Cotes ordinarily dated books according to the legal year: as will presently be seen, *Wit without Money* is an instance.

¹³ "Shirley's Years in Ireland," *RES.*, xx, 22-28.

¹⁴ *Strafforde's Letters*, II, 400, 406.

to convoy thence a ship laden with men and munitions for the relief of Dunbarton.¹⁵ This was Owen's single employment against the Scots that spring, for the *Whelp* came to a woeful end on the northward voyage.¹⁶ Now, in his dedication Shirley speaks of "services" which Owen was about to undertake "against a rebellious enemy"—that is, the Scots. It is clear, then, that Shirley was "wafted" home by Owen on the trip from Dublin to Chester. The crossing must have occurred about April 16. Strafford wrote on the 12th that the *Whelp* would come over "within two or three Days at furthest,"¹⁷ but some allowance should be made for Shirley's last-minute preparations and the need of finding a wind. From these considerations and the fact that two plays were entered to a new publisher on April 28,¹⁸ we may infer that Shirley reached London around the 20th of the month.

The date of Shirley's return, thus ascertained, is of aid in conjecturing the publication dates of the 1639-40 plays. For *The Opportunitie* according to its dedication was "emergent from the Presse" when its author reached London. Allowing ten days for the printing of a play and noting that Cotes probably had two presses, we might assign *The Maides Revenge* to the first part of March, *Loves Crueltie* to the beginning of April, and *The Opportunitie* to the latter half of that month—or (more boldly) the whole family of seven plays to the months of March and April.¹⁹

ALLAN H. STEVENSON

The University of Chicago

THE EARLY FAME OF GAVIN DOUGLAS'S *ENEADOS*

A new edition of Gavin Douglas's rendering of the *Aeneid* is long overdue. That work is notable, not only as the first translation of Virgil into the vernacular in Britain, but also for its considerable poetic merits, which are particularly apparent in the lengthy prologues that the Bishop added to each book—verses of

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 410.

¹⁶ On May 11: "Shirley's Years in Ireland," p. 27.

¹⁷ *Strafforde's Letters*, II, 410.

¹⁸ *The Constant Maid* and *St. Patrick for Ireland*.

¹⁹ Typography and watermarks support this conjecture, but they will be considered in another paper.

wide range and varying form, sometimes full of keen observation and pungent colloquialism, sometimes rising to the power and dignity of a hymn to the godhead. Yet they are known today, if they are known at all, only from brief excerpts in a few anthologies. The last edition of the *Eneados* was published in 1874; it is out of date, and has long been out of print and hard to come by.

The editor who proposes to make the poem once more easily accessible soon discovers that formerly it did not lack appreciative readers.¹ Five manuscripts of the *Eneados* have survived, and they themselves provide some indication of the success that immediately attended it. The earliest extant text, now in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge (No. 1184 in M. R. James's Catalogue), was copied by Mathew Geddes, the Bishop's chaplain and one of his executors, shortly after 1513; its marginalia include notes in two other sixteenth-century hands. The five manuscripts, which all date from the first half of the sixteenth century, fall into two distinct groups; and the evidence of variant readings forces us to assume the existence of lost intermediate texts, all prior to Copland's Black Letter Quarto (1553)—the first printed edition, which must itself have been based on a manuscript in the same tradition as, but certainly not identical with, the Ruthven manuscript, now in the Library of Edinburgh University.² It seems safe to suppose that at least ten copies of this long work (Douglas has two lines for each line of Virgil's) were made in less than forty years.

Surrey certainly had access to a copy. There is proof that he read it carefully, even though he did not always understand its Scots idioms: he drew on it for his own translation of Virgil, now taking over a Northern word ('spreitles,' 'skaithful,' 'ugsome'), now misinterpreting a Scots phrase (confusing 'hy' in the phrase 'in hy'—in haste—with 'high').³ Whether Surrey was prompted

¹ William Geddie (*A Bibliography of Middle Scots Poets*, Scottish Text Society, 1912, introduction, and pp. 223 ff.) collected an imposing array of criticisms and allusions, but it includes only a few of the references quoted in this article.

² A detailed account of all the MSS. is given in an unpublished thesis by Edith Bannister, 'An Edition of the Prologues to Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*,' deposited in the Bodleian.

³ George Frederick Nott was the first to indicate Surrey's indebtedness, in his edition of *The Works of Surrey and Wyatt*, 1815-16. See also *The Times Literary Supplement*, 1936, pp. 791, 863.

by reading Douglas to undertake the Englishing of Virgil we cannot say; but it seems a reasonable hypothesis. And we may assume that the learned James VI (James I of England) read with relish Douglas's Prologues in his own tongue, since a passage in his *schort treatise, conteining some revlis and cautelis to be obseruit and eschewit in Scottis Poesie* (1584), reminding a would-be translator that 'ze not onely essay not zour awin ingyne of inuentioun, bot be the same meanes, ze are bound, as to a staik, to follow that buikis phrasis, quhilk ze translate,' seems to borrow its simile from the First Prologue, in which the bishop dwells on the difficulties of his task:

Quha is attachit ontill a staik, we se,
May ga na ferthir, bot wreil about that tre.
Rycht so am I to Virgillis text ybund. (ll. 297-9)

However well-known Douglas's work may have been in the North, his 'lewit barbour tong' (the phrase is his own) must have been an obstacle to Southern English readers; and William Copland carefully anglicised his copy, substituting English words and flexions and, as a staunch Protestant, permitting no 'popish' references to pass unaltered. How many copies were printed, and how many sold, we do not know. But the edition must have got into general circulation, since it was still in use in the seventeenth century. By that time Douglas was beginning to be ranked with the poet whom he himself had hailed as 'my mastir Chauser,' 'principal poet but peir.'

Chawcer, Gowre, the bishop of dunkell,
In ages farre remote were eloquent:
Now Sidney, Spencer, others moe excell,

writes John Norden in *The Labyrinth of Mans Life, or Vertues Delight ane Enuies opposite* (London, 1614). It was a century of enthusiastic philologists and lexicographers, and Douglas came to be studied, not only as a translator of Virgil but as a treasury of ancient words. From the *Eneados*, says William Lisle in the preface to his *Saxon Treatise Concerning the Old and New Testament* (1623), 'I got more knowledge of that I sought [viz., understanding of Old English] than by any of the other.' In 1646 Sir William Dugdale made a glossary of words in Bellenden's *Boethius* and Douglas's *Eneados* which shows that he had perused both with

care.⁴ His interest may well have been quickened by his friend Franciscus Junius, who placed Douglas ('poeta Scotorum princeps') on a level with Chaucer, compiled a glossary (now Bodleian MS. Junius 114) more comprehensive than Dugdale's, and cited Douglas constantly in his numerous etymological collections. Writing to Dugdale on the third of February 1667/8, he notes that there are 'manie passages wherein this wittie Gawin doth grosly mistake Virgil, and is much ledd out of the way by the infection of a monkish ignorance then prevailing in Church and commonwealth: yet is there verie good use to be made of him.'⁵ Before Junius died in Oxford ten years later the young William Nicolson had come up to Queen's as an undergraduate; Nicolson, who was to become Bishop of Carlisle and author of the *Scottish Historical Library*, certainly had access to Junius's collections, and it may well have been Junius who led him to an appreciation of the Scottish poet. In an unpublished letter to Thomas Gale, Dean of York, Nicolson mentions that 'Bp Douglas work has a great name, and considering the time when it was done, very deservedly, yet it can not be deny'd but in many places it wants the file . . .'; the same letter shows that he was familiar with the Bath manuscript of the *Eneados*, then in the possession of Lord Weymouth, and with the proposals for a new edition, which were to bear fruit in 1710.⁶

Before that date several of the other 'Saxonists' whom Junius directly or indirectly inspired had turned their attention to Douglas's verse. Edmund Gibson quotes from it in the notes to his edition of *Polemo-Middinia* (1691); George Hickes combed it for examples of early forms to be cited in his massive *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Thesaurus Grammatico-Criticus et Archaeologicus* (1703-5). Edward Thwaites proposed to do the same in preparing his abortive edition of Junius's *Etymologicum*; his *Grammatica Anglo-Saxonica* (1711) includes many corrections to the Glossary in the 1710 edition, which Urry, the future editor

⁴ The glossary now occupies Ff. 64r-69v of Bodleian MS. Ashmole 846.

⁵ Dugdale, *Correspondence* (ed. Hamper), p. 383.

⁶ The letter (undated) is bound up with an interleaved copy of the Glossary for the 1710 edition in the Bodleian (ptd. bk. N. 2. 13 Art. Seld.). Nicolson mentions the Cambridge MS. (then owned by Dean Gale) in his *Scottish Historical Library* (1702).

of Chaucer, also studied carefully.⁷ Of that edition (published in Edinburgh) Thomas Ruddiman, proof-reader for the printer Robert Freebairn, seems to have been in complete charge. He corrected Copland's text by the Ruthven manuscript, which was by then accessible in the University Library at Edinburgh; and he added sensible 'General Rules for Understanding the Language.' It appeared in time for Elizabeth Elstob to quote from it in the preface to her *Rudiments of Grammar for the English-Saxon Tongue* (1715). She took the opportunity to praise the author of this 'judicious and accurate Translation of Vergil,' whom she considered 'as great a Poet, considering his time, as this Island hath produced.' She was to be the last survivor of a group of scholars who had shared a passion for all poetry and prose written in the older language. When Joseph Trapp published his blank verse rendering of Virgil at Oxford a few years later he mentioned Douglas's version only to remark that it 'is said to be a very extraordinary Work by Those who understand it better than I do.'⁸ A more acute and more catholic critic, Dr. John Campbell—the anonymous author of *The Polite Correspondence*—also confessed to some difficulty with the language. But his praise was unstinted:

... it is scarce possible for me to express my Surprise, when after a short Acquaintance with this Author, I discovered that he was by far the ablest Translator who ever attempted the Works of this Prince of the Latin Poets. His Translation, in my Judgment, has all the Advantages a Translation can have; it is close, concise, and comparable in its Beauties, to the Original itself: In short I know nothing equal to it, unless it be Chapman's Homer, which, take it altogether, is a wonderful Book, but then its Excellency lies in the Author's Genius, and not in the Justness of the Translation; whereas the Bishop of Dunkell shows himself to have been a Great Man, by showing him a Great, that is an exact Translator.⁹

Admiration could no further go. During the remainder of the eighteenth century Douglas's description of the seasons in his seventh, twelfth, and thirteenth Prologues were reprinted, or ele-

⁷ The copy of the Glossary described in note 1 *supra* is annotated by Urry and Thwaites; it is mentioned in Bodleian MS. Ballard 19, f. 176.

⁸ *The Aeneis of Vergil* . . . 1718 (Introduction).

⁹ *The Polite Correspondence, or Rational Amusement* [c. 1741]; Letter VII.

Thomas Gray's liking for Douglas's poetry, and Jerome Stone's praise of it, have already been noted by Dr. René Wellek, *The Rise of English Literary History* (1941), pp. 115, 223.

gantly paraphrased, more than once. But the *Eneados* as a whole did not receive the attention it deserves until in 1778 Thomas Warton published the second volume of his *History of English Poetry*, in which Douglas is accorded the dignity of a separate chapter. Thereafter, as a glance at Geddie's *Bibliography* will show, his place in the history of literature was secure.

J. A. W. BENNETT

*The Queen's College,
Oxford*

LEAR AND THE PSALMIST

In an earlier study of biblical influences in *Hamlet*,¹ I have shown that when Shakespeare used biblical phrases their context often lingered in his memory. An interesting example of this is a biblical echo in *Hamlet*, the context of which serves as a source for a passage in *King Lear*.

In *Hamlet*, iv. ii. 30, Hamlet jestingly says, "The king is a thing . . . Of nothing," echoing Psalms 144: 4 as given in the Great Bible and the Prayer-Book versions. I quote this verse and the ones immediately following it from the Great Bible (1539):

*Man is lyke a thyng of naught, his time passeth awaye like a shadowe.
Bowe thy heauens, O Lord, and come downe, touche the mountaynes, &
they shall smoke.*

*Sende forth the lyghtnyng, and scatter them, shute out thyne arowes, and
consume them.*

*Sende downe thyne hande from aboue, deliuer me, & take me out of y^e
great waters, from y^e hande of straunge chyldren.*

*Whose mouth talketh of vanitie, & their ryght hande is a ryght hande
of wickednes. . . .*

*Saue me, and delyuer me from the hande of straunge chyldren, whose
mouth talketh of vanit[i]e, and their ryght hande is a ryght hande of
inquit[i]e. (vv. 4-8, 11)*

With this passage, compare the opening lines of *Lear*, III. ii:

Blow, winds, and crack your cheeks! rage! blow!
You cataracts and hurricanoes, spout
Till you have drench'd our steeples, drown'd the cocks!
You sulphurous and thought-executing fires,

¹ In *The Character of Hamlet*, University of North Carolina Press, 1941.

Vaunt-couriers of cleaving thunderbolts,
 Singe my white head! And thou, all-shaking thunder,
 Smite flat the thick rotundity of the world!
 Crack nature's moulds, all germens spill at once,
 That makes ingrateful man! . . .
 Rumble thy bellyful! Spit, fire! spout, rain!
 Nor rain, wind, thunder, fire, are my daughters.
 I tax not you, you elements, with unkindness;
 I never gave you kingdom, call'd you children,
 You owe me no subscription. Then let fall
 Your horrible pleasure.

The Psalmist's wish that the heavens may fall, the mountains be consumed, and the lightnings smite mankind, together with the reference to "the great waters," is a fairly close parallel to the floods, lightnings, and destruction of the world which Lear invokes because of his wicked children. The most obvious influence, however, results from the Psalmist's use of the phrase "straunge chyldren." To Shakespeare and other Elizabethans, the word "strange" frequently meant "estranged, unfriendly, unnaturally hostile"; and this usage seems the most logical in interpreting the biblical phrase. Even though the meaning of the original may have been "strangers," a reading given in some sixteenth century English versions of the Bible, the phrase "straunge chyldren" would seem more applicable to estranged and unnatural offspring than to foreign persecutors.

Accepting this as Shakespeare's probable interpretation, we find that the parallel gains in significance thereby. Both the Psalmist and Lear seem to regard the ingratitude of children as an unnatural aberration from universal laws and to think of a vast convulsion in nature as the fitting accompaniment of such an aberration. This supposed interplay of human and cosmic forces is explicitly stated by the Gentleman, in iv. vi. 209-211:

Thou hast one daughter,
 Who redeems *nature* from the *general curse*
 Which twain have brought her to.

The conception of men's actions as manifestations of a titanic struggle between good and evil in both the moral and physical worlds gives to the play much of its tremendous power and dignifies Lear as something more than a foolishly irate old man. The germ of this conception is found in the words of the Psalmist. Perhaps

his invoking the lightnings and arrows of the Lord may further have suggested Gloucester's somber prophecy in III. vii:

But I shall see
The winged vengeance overtake such children.

JOHN E. HANKINS

University of Kansas

MIDDLETON'S RESIDENCE AT OXFORD

The fact of Thomas Middleton's attendance at Oxford is established¹ but all that has been known to date is that he was matriculated from Queen's College in April 1598 and that years later he spoke loyally of that college.² It is now possible to state that he was at Oxford over three years. The dramatist himself supplies the information.

His words occur in a deed³ enrolled "duodecima die Decembris Anno R[egni] R[eginae] Eliz[abeth] quadragesimo tertio"—hence, December 12, 1601. He says:

I Thomas midleton⁴ of london gent sone of William midleton late cittizen and Bricklayer of london deceased . . . for and in consideration of a c[er]ten competent some of lawfull mony of England [paid Middleton by his brother-in-law Allan Waterer] before then sealing & delyv[er]ye hereof paid and disbursed for my advauncement & p[re]ferment in the Vniv[er]sity of Oxford where I am nowe a student [sic]⁵ and for my maintenance with meat drinke and apparrell and other necessaries for me meet and convenient . . . have . . . sold . . . and set over . . . that my moyety or one half part . . . in . . . that great . . . garden plott called the Curteyne garden conteyning by estymation fower acres . . . and all other the landes & groundes therevnto adjoyning together with all . . . whatsoever now standing . . . in or vpon the same . . . and also all the . . . parcell of ground parcell of Stebunheath aforesaid⁶ and all . . . buildings therevpon stand-

¹ Mark Eccles, "Middleton's Birth and Education," *RES*, VII (1931), 436-437.

² M. G. Christian, "An Autobiographical Note by Thomas Middleton," *N & Q*, Vol. 175, No. 15 (October 8, 1938), 259-260, calls attention to the passage in Middleton's *The Triumphs of Love and Antiquity*.

³ *Close Roll* extract c. 54/1693.

⁴ This spelling occurs throughout the document except in one instance where the *d* is doubled.

⁵ My italics.

⁶ The *Close Roll* cited has described it in detail. Thomas and his sister Avice had inherited it and the Curtain property from their father.

ing. . . . With the wharfes easementes com[m]odities & appartenance to the same belonging as aforesaid . . . forever.

This deed had been sealed "the eight and twentieth daye of June 1600 and in the two and fortieth [*sic*] yere of the raigne of our sov[er]aigne ladye Elizabeth. . . ." ⁷

Professor Mark Eccles has cited this document ⁸ in reference to the Curtain property but without mentioning its establishment of the fact that Middleton's residence at Oxford was over three years long.

From the April 1598 matriculation of Middleton to the December 1601 deed is three full years and into the beginning of a new academic year. The implication is strong that Thomas Middleton was headed for the completion of his A. B. degree. Certain it is that in 1601 he sank all his worldly goods in a determined effort to remain at Oxford.

MILDRED G. CHRISTIAN

Newcomb College, Tulane University

ON POE'S "VALLEY OF UNREST"

The meaning of *Nis* Poe told us himself. It was in the earliest version of "The Valley of Unrest," published in Poe's *Poems*, New York, 1831, pp. 73-75, as "The Valley Nis." In two lines of this earliest version Poe gives the meaning of his strange and haunting word:

But 'the valley Nis' at best
Means 'the valley of unrest.'

These lines do not occur in the final version of the poem in the edition of 1845. What *Nis* means is, therefore, clear—but where it came from is another matter. In suggesting a possible origin of the word, the method employed by Poe himself in prose and poetry is available: namely, that of reasoning.¹

The appearance and sound of *Nis* suggest that it is a composed word. *Dis* or *Dis pater* was in Roman religion an underworld god, identical with the Greek Pluto. As a prefix in English the Latin *dis-* denotes away, apart, asunder; undoing, reversal, privation, or

⁷ *Close Roll* cited, *passim*.

⁸ *Loc. cit.*

¹ Cf. "De Maistre et Edgar Poe m'ont appris à raisonner," *Journaux Intimes* de Charles Baudelaire.

negation; it denotes to strip or divest of something, hence to expel from; to divest of the character, rank, or status of; also, to free from, or relieve of. (All are simple dictionary meanings.) *Dis* in the above uses, and also as the name of a god of the underworld connotes another Latin word of privation or nothing: *nihil* with its contraction, *nil*.

Compound two words of similar meanings and a composed word results suggesting the appearance and sound of both. The composed word *nis* in addition to combining the sound and appearance of both words, retains the suggestion of both words: the underworld, realm of shades, of sorrow, and of loss—place of dimness and night; also, nothing—the nothingness that follows tragic loss, and the nowhere-ness of place as the abode of shades and the universal sorrow of those who mourn. As Poe said in 1831:

Far away—far away— / Far away—as far at least / Lies that valley
as the day / Down within the golden east— / All things lovely—are not
they / Far away—far away? / It is called the valley Nis. /

A comparable idea was expressed by Thomas Hood in his *Bridge of Sighs*, published in 1844, and quoted entire by Poe in *The Poetic Principle*. The lines referred to are:

Anywhere, anywhere /
Out of the world!

A later echo sounds from both Poe and Hood: Baudelaire's poem in prose with its English title, "*Anywhere Out of the World*." It also fits into the general pattern of imagery, symbol, and overtone developed by Poe throughout his poetry. These elements—employed and built upon by Baudelaire who acknowledged Poe as master—also fit into the technique and content of symbolism: the modern movement in poetry and prose that grew out of Poe and Baudelaire.²

THOMAS F. BLEDSOE

New York City

² The author knows of other interpretations of Poe's poem. The following note from Dr. T. O. Mabbott is quoted by permission. "Miss Phillips quoted Mr. Hogg as thinking Nis a childish form of Innis; someone has suggested a water spirit called Nis is alluded to; Campbell (followed by Quinn) thought there was an anagram of *sin*; and (not in print) I have wondered if there is an anagram of Sin, the Semitic Moon God. I know of two other ideas, unprinted. But as yet no absolutely consistent explanation of Poe's poem has met my eye, and I hope for an early publication of your theory. It is better than the others printed, in my opinion!"

A NOTE ON WHITMAN'S MOCKINGBIRD

"Out of the Cradle Endlessly Rocking," published in 1860, portrays the habits of a pair of mockingbirds analogous to that in *Birds of Long Island*, a book of ornithology published sixteen years before.¹ Since the thoughts are identical and the wording similar, this bit of informative prose might very well have furnished the source for the factual setting of Walt Whitman's poem:

"Although a constant resident in Southern States, this unrivaled songster passes the season of reproduction on Long Island."

Once Paumanok,
When lilac-scent was in the air and Fifth-month
grass was growing,

"The nest is placed among the briers . . . the eggs, from four to six in number, are light green, spotted with brown . . . at times it frequents the dry sandy beaches in the immediate vicinity of the sea."

Up this seashore in some briers,
Two feather'd guests from Alabama, two together,
And their nest, and four light-green eggs spotted
with brown,

"At Egg Harbor . . . a few years since a bird of this species passed the summer on the beach. It became the pet of the residents, to whom it also seemed much attached." . . .

And every day I, a curious boy, never too close,
never disturbing them,
Cautiously peering, absorbing, translating . . .
And henceforward all summer in the sound of the sea,

"and as if in return for the attention they paid to its wants, it poured forth its charming melody, which, on calm, bright nights, blended with the subdued voice of the ocean,"

And at night under the full of the moon in calmer
weather,
Over the hoarse surging of the sea,
Or flitting from brier to brier by day, . . .
Out of the mocking-bird's throat, the musical shuttle, . . .
Two together!
Winds blow south or winds blow north, . . .
Singing all time, minding no time,
While we two keep together.

¹ J. P. Giraud, Jr., *Birds of Long Island*, New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1844, pp. 82, 83.

. . . the notes of the bird continuous echoing,
 . . . the fierce old mother incessantly moaning, . . .
 The yellow half-moon enlarged, sagging down,

"rendering the scene enchanting beyond the power of description."

. . . Yes, when the stars glisten'd
 All night long on the prong of a moss-scallop'd stake,
 Down almost amid the slapping waves,
 Sat the lone singer wonderful causing tears.
 . . . A thousand warbling echoes have started
 to life within me, never to die.

Whitman was a constant visitor at New York libraries. Could it be that he may have read this item and molded the poem to its description and his boyhood memories of days on the Long Island shore?

FLORENCE MACDERMID CHACE

Cambridge, Mass.

HAMANN'S OPINION OF HERDER'S *URSACHEN DES GESUNKNEN GESCHMACKS*

Any evaluation of a work by Johann Gottfried Herder which would leave out of consideration the reaction of Herder's friend and most capable critic, Johann Georg Hamann, would run the danger of neglecting the most important contemporary criticism of the work concerned. Hamann's opinion was urgently sought by Herder, since the Magus of the North knew better than any other person what Herder was attempting to do in the two decades from 1764 to 1784. Always frank and frequently vigorous, that opinion is of great importance today, as representing the most significant critical attitude of the time. This fact is always recognized in the monumental biography of Herder by Rudolf Haym.¹ In one case, however, the work to which a criticism by Hamann refers is uncertain; seemingly unimportant, the correct reference of the passage has much wider implications than would appear on superficial reading. The passage occurs in Hamann's letter to Herder of August 9, 1776:

¹ Rudolf Haym, *Herder, nach seinem Leben und seinen Werken dargestellt* (Berlin, I, 1880; II, 1885).

Ihre Preisschrift habe ich an einem Abend durchgelaufen. Sie schien mir die Frage dreist aufgelöst, aber die Sache selbst so wenig als möglich berührt zu haben.²

Herder had written three "Preisschriften" by the time this letter was sent: (1) the *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* (1772), crowned with the prize by the Berlin Academy of Sciences; (2) *Ursachen des gesunkenen Geschmacks* (1775), also crowned by the same Academy; and (3) *Uebers Erkennen und Empfinden in der menschlichen Seele*, submitted in 1774 and rejected, then revised and submitted in 1775 as *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden, den zwei Hauptkräften der menschlichen Seele*, but again unsuccessfully. The third, revised again, finally appeared independently as *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden der menschlichen Seele* (1778).

Our letter obviously does not refer to Herder's first "Preisschrift," concerning which Hamann had made, in 1772 and 1773, such "rasende Sprünge"³ as seriously to endanger the friendship between the two men.⁴ All differences had long since been settled in a friendly fashion, and the *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache*, the cause of Hamann's violent reaction, had by 1775 been dropped from their correspondence.

Haym interprets the passage mentioned as bearing upon the third (unsuccessful) prize-essay. In a note to p. 668 of volume I we read:

"Sie haben," schreibt Hamann in einer Stelle (Schriften v, 172), die ich auf diese, nicht auf die gedruckte Preisarbeit über den Geschmack beziehe, "die Frage dreist aufgelöst, aber die Sache selbst so wenig als möglich berührt."

In spite of the slight changes which Haym allowed himself in the citation of the text, he was too good a scholar not to recognize that the passage could refer to the second prize-essay, and his note honestly indicates that fact. I shall attempt briefly to show from the correspondence that Hamann could only have meant the second essay.

The first reference to the *Ursachen des gesunkenen Geschmacks* occurs in Hamann's letter of June 8, 1775, to Herder, evincing

² *Hamann's Schriften*, hrsg. Roth (Berlin, 1824), v, 171-172.

³ Cf. Hamann to Hartknoch, Oct. 24, 1774, in Roth, *op. cit.*, v, 101.

⁴ Haym, *op. cit.*, I, 491 ff.

delight that his friend had a second time won "den pythischen Preis,"⁵ and continuing: "Ich habe von der ganzen Frage nichts gewußt." Obviously, then, he could not have known that Herder had entered the competition.

Herder replied to this letter with another impossible to date exactly, but undoubtedly written around the middle of June, 1775, and so dated by Otto Hoffmann in his edition of Herder's letters to Hamann.⁶ Meanwhile, in another letter of June 3, 1775, which crossed Hamann's of the 8th, Herder had announced to the Magus the visits of Hartknoch and (later) of Kanter to Bückeburg. In his June 15(?) letter Herder now wrote of the *Ursachen des gesunkenen Geschmacks*:

. . . Die Abhandlung war vergessen, und ich traute ihr den Preis so wenig zu, als meinem Miethpferd, worauf ich bisweilen ausstolpere, den Olympischen Preis . . . Denn die Abhandl. taugt, meines Erachtens, wenig mehr als eine belletristische Schulübung. . . . Sie (Hamann) sollen die Abhandl. im Kleck oder konterfeit auf der fahrenden Post erhalten und sehen.⁷

Hamann received both letters, but did not answer immediately. Herder, meanwhile, went on a four-weeks' journey to Darmstadt. On July 16-17 Hamann wrote to Herder, but made no mention of receiving the promised copy of the prize-essay.⁸ Herder's next letter (July 29) also makes no mention of any "Preisschrift,"⁹ but Hamann's reply of August 14 has one cryptic reference:

Gott segne Ihre mannigfaltigen Arbeiten, Ihre Ausarbeitung der Preisschrift, Ihre Fortsetzung der Urkunde—und lassen Sie den Geist immer milder und markiger werden.¹⁰

Which "Preisschrift?" Obviously the third, since the second one had long since been accepted by the Academy and had been dismissed by Herder as finished. But since no mention of the third occurs in all the correspondence up to this point, how did Hamann know that Herder was at work on the "Ausarbeitung" of his third entry? The only answer is that he heard orally through Hartknoch, who had visited Herder in May. We know

⁵ Roth, *op. cit.*, v, 143-144.

⁶ Otto Hoffmann, *Herders Briefe an Joh. Georg Hamann* (Berlin, 1889), 101-103.

⁷ *Idem.*

⁸ Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, 103-105.

⁹ Roth, *op. cit.*, v, 148-152.

¹⁰ Roth, *op. cit.*, v, 158.

that a possible manuscript of the third was not brought to Hamann by Hartknoch, however, because Herder twice listed what Hartknoch was bringing, and twice inquired Hamann's opinion about it. The third essay is listed in neither place.¹¹ Up to this point the correspondence is complete.

Hamann's next preserved letter (January 28, 1776) complains that Herder has not answered his of September 6, 1775, which is lost and probably never reached Herder. Hamann expressly states that the last news of any kind received from Bückeburg was Herder's letter of August 25, 1775.¹² He also says:

Ihre Preisschrift erwarte ich, habe aber selbige schon den 6ten Dec. am Tage Nicolai des Abends durchgelaufen. Weiß nicht ein lebendig Wort davon, und was Sie selbst wissen, darf ich nicht schreiben,—daß Sie den Preis verdient haben und verdienen.—Auch Wahrheiten haben Sie gesagt, aber in der Hauptsache zu wenig für mich und für Ihre Freunde und Feinde.¹³

The salient points here are the date, Dec. 6, 1775, the time ("des Abends"), and the verb "durchgelaufen." Obviously, Hamann had obtained a printed copy of the now available second "Preisschrift," but had not yet received his presentation-copy from Herder.

Herder left this letter also unanswered until July 20, 1776. The dealings with Göttingen, with the ministry in Hannover, then with Goethe and Weimar, as well as the burdens of his new offices in Bückeburg, precluded his writing many letters to friends. When he finally did answer all of Hamann's letters at once, he mentioned for the first time the third prize-essay:

In Berlin habe ich (*sub Rosa!*) zum 3ten mal die Krone erlangen wollen, aber nicht erlangt, vermuthlich weil ich Sulzer zu gerade widersprochen und es müde ward, mit den Luftblasen der Akademie mehr zu spielen. . . . Ich habe meine Schrift zurückgefodert und will sie publiciren; noch aber sie nicht erhalten.¹⁴

In the meanwhile, Hamann had written his letter of August 9, 1776, before receiving this first notice of Herder's unsuccessful entry; we can prove this through the fact that Herder's letter men-

¹¹ Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, 99 and 104.

¹² Roth, *op. cit.*, v, 159.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 160.

¹⁴ Hoffmann, *op. cit.*, 115.

tions the happy birth of his second child, while Hamann's ends with a wish for Caroline's successful delivery. There is nothing anywhere to indicate that Hamann knew, before receiving Herder's letter of July 20, that Herder had actually entered the third competition announced by the Academy of Berlin. He knew the topic, and that Herder was working on it. But there is not the slightest evidence that he saw or knew the contents of any version of *Vom Erkennen und Empfinden der menschlichen Seele* before its publication—certainly not before writing the passage quoted at the beginning of this article. The words undoubtedly refer to Herder's second, successful prize-essay, *Ursachen des gesunkenen Geschmacks*, and constitute a repetition of the salient points, emphasized above, in Hamann's letter of January 28, 1776. The repetition was occasioned through the fact that Hamann had no way of knowing whether the earlier letter had been received.

What are the implications of this reference? It is impossible to do more than point out a few. First of all, Hamann's friendly lines, when applied to the second essay, show that at least one keenly understanding reader and friend felt that this essay made ridiculous the very framing of the question itself: "Quelles sont les causes de la décadence et de la corruption du goût?" With regard to his third entry Herder himself admitted to Zimmermann¹⁵ that his intention was to prove the exact contrary of what the Academy wanted and that he thus had no hope of the prize. Herder's most dependable biographer, Haym, devotes much care to pointing out step by step how Herder did this. But his demonstration does not need the additional proof of our letter—the material is quite sufficient without that. Now, if the letter refers to the second prize-essay, the question arises: Is it not possible that even the first "Preisschrift," the famous *Abhandlung über den Ursprung der Sprache* itself, had a similar bearing? Hamann certainly said so, and would have said it in print in his (unpublished) *Philologische Einfälle und Zweifel*.¹⁶ Herder's own nervous letters to Nicolai, expressing the fear that he had been too impudent—"Ich weiß nicht, welcher Dämon mich beherrscht hat, so für die Akademie schreiben zu können"¹⁷—underline the correct-

¹⁵ Cf. Haym, *op. cit.*, I, 668 ff.

¹⁶ Roth, *op. cit.*, IV, 48-49.

¹⁷ Otto Hoffmann, *Herders Briefwechsel mit Nicolai* (Berlin, 1887), 70. (Herder to Nicolai, February 1, 1772.)

ness of Hamann's imputation. If Hamann was right in two cases—and Herder himself admitted the ulterior purpose of the third essay—all three of these entries, two of them successful, would have to be interpreted as written with a double purpose: to make a contribution and at the same time to make fun of the Academy. Such an interpretation of course, would go aside from the usual Romantic approach to Herder, which consists in lifting certain appealing sentences out of their context. But it would be far more in accord with the Swiftian spirit of the "Dechant"—as Goethe and the Strassburg circle promptly christened Herder on the latter's arrival in that city in 1770.

ROBERT T. CLARK, JR.

The University of Texas

GENCZLICHKEIT

In M. J. Melbers *Vocabularius predicantium sive variloquus*¹ fällt die Wiedergabe von *salus* durch *genczlichkeit*—neben *seligkeit*, *heilsamkeit*—ins Auge.² Wie das Vokabular das Wort verstanden wissen will, zeigt ein späteres Lemma *salvus* / *ein ganczer durch das hail*. Mithin beruhen Heil und Seligkeit in der ungebrochenen Ganzheit der Person. Kein Geisteswissenschaftler, der sich dieses Lemma entgehen lassen würde. Bekenntnis zur Individualität als Grundlage persönlichen Glücksgefühls. Wie schade, daß Burdach nicht mehr lebt, um auf diese prächtige Quelle sein Menschenbild der Renaissance zu stützen.³ Doch hält die verführerische Deutung der Nachprüfung nicht stand. Σωτηρία, dem im Lateinischen *salus* entspricht, ist bei Wulfila *naseins*, dessen Stamm in Nhd. *Genesung* fortlebt. Im Ahd. erscheint neben überwiegendem *heil* öfter auch

¹ Nach dem Vorgang von Edward Schröder haben die Germanisten Melbers Wörterbuch auf 'etwa 1474' angesetzt. Nachdem die Incunabel-Forschung Drach in Speier als Drucker festgestellt hat, ist sie geneigt, den Erstdruck für kaum jünger als 1478 zu halten. Ein Zweitdruck ist in Reutlingen ca. 1480 erschienen, ein dritter in Nürnberg 1481.

² Vgl. Diefenbach, *Glossarium Latino-Germanicum*, 509c.

³ Der *Variloquus* gehört ja zu den am weitesten verbreiteten Wörterbüchern des ausgehenden 15. Jh. Zwischen erstem Erscheinen und dem Jahr 1500 gibt es 23 verschiedene Drucke, d. h. in jedem Jahr durchschnittlich einen. (15 davon sind in amerikanischen Bibliotheken.)

genist, über dessen genaues Vorkommen Aumann, *Beiträge* 63 (1939), 446 f. Auskunft gibt. Obgleich dieses *genist* im Mhd. auch einmal als *genis* (Lexer 1, 859 f.) belegt ist, war der Akzent auf der Stammsilbe fest genug, um selbst gelegentliches Zusammenziehen zu *gencz* unmöglich zu machen. Es führt keine Linie von *genist* zu *gencz*.

In einigen deutschen Bibel-Handschriften des 15. Jh. lautet im 2. Makkabäer 3, 22 das *cum omni integritate* der *Vulgata* mit *aller genczlichkeit*, wofür sämtliche vorlutherischen Bibeldrucke mit *aller gerechtikeit* setzen.⁴ Die Verdeutschung *unversehrt* erhält sich in der *Züricher Bibel*. Luther liest das Hebräische anders und verzichtet auf die Wiedergabe von *cum omni integritate*.

Integritas war also das Wort, das die Bibelhandschriften durch *genczlichkeit* wiederzugeben versuchten, die *Züricher* durch die Wendung *unversehrt*. Es überrascht nicht, bei Melber auch für *integritas* (wie schon *DWb*, 4, 1, 1311 verzeichnet) *genczlichkeit* zu finden. An der Vermischung der beiden Lemmata ist sicherlich *heil* schuld. Das Md. und Ndd. haben noch heute für *integer* den Ausdruck *heil*, der dem Obd.—in *dieser* Bedeutung—fremd geworden und durch *ganz* verdrängt ist.⁵ So konnte schon 1470 im obd. Munde *heil* durch *ganz*, *genczlich* ersetzt werden, *heilsamkeit* analog durch *genczlichkeit*; denn in dem Wort *heil* berühren sich ja die Begriffssphären für *integer*, *salubris* und *salvus*. Bei dieser Gelegenheit sei noch darauf hingewiesen, daß Aumann aao. 449 einen Unterschied zwischen dem Althochdeutschen und dem Altniederfränkischen verzeichnet, indem das letztere *salus* immer durch *sâlda* übersetzt, was zwar dem eigentlichen Ahd. nicht fremd ist, aber z. B. bei Notker nur immer für *fortuna* und *felicitas* erscheint. Diese alten Verhältnisse spiegelt noch ein *Glossarium Batavicum* des 14. Jh., von dem Diefenbach aao. 509 meldet, daß es ein halbes Jahrtausend nach den altndfrk. *Psalmen* (Pw) und den *Glossis Lipsii* (GIL) *salus* immer wiedergibt durch *salde*.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

The Johns Hopkins University

⁴ Vgl. Kurrelmeyer, *Die erste deutsche Bibel*. 10. Band, 281.

⁵ Vgl. dazu *DWb*. 4, 2, 817, und besonders Kluge-Götze, *Etymolog. Wtb.*¹¹ (1934), 240 mit dem im Obd. unbekannten Ausdruck *heilfroh* für *ganz froh*.

YIDDISCH (T)SCHALE(N)T = FRANZÖSISCH CHAUD?

Die *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (1941), III, 347, s. v. *Cooking* schreibt über dies Gericht: 'Out of the necessity for having warm food on the Sabbath and the proscription against cooking on the Sabbath, has come the dish commonly known in the Western world as *tschalent*. . . . The word *tschalent* itself seems to have been derived from the Old French form of *chaud*—hot—which was once spelled *chauld*. The Italian word is *caldo*, and either form might easily have developed into *tschalet*, to which an *n* was finally added for easier pronunciation. Prepared in many combinations, *tschalent* requires being kept in the oven overnight. It may consist of meat, *kishke* (stuffed intestine), potatoes, barley and beans all mixed together. In poorer homes it more frequently appears without meat and with fewer ingredients. The taste is derived from the long steaming in the oven. In the small-town Jewish communities of Eastern Europe of the last century the *tschalent* was kept in the bakers' oven overnight, and carried home after the Sabbath morning services." Das erwähnte *Kishke* wird ebenda S. 351 definiert: "*Kishke* is stuffed intestine. Bread crumbs or flour, fat and minced onion constitute the stuffing. It is boiled or roasted with the meat." In dem Artikel von S. Birnbaum über *Yiddish* (x, 599) wird das Wort *shulent* 'Shalet' unter den alten Romanismen des Yiddish (Typus *benschen* < *benedicere*, frz. *bénir*, *béniss-ons*) erwähnt und dieselbe Etymologie gegeben: "cf. Italian *scaldato*, Old French *chauld*." Mir selbst ist von meinem aus Pressburg stammenden Vater die Form *scholet* bekannt, die offenbar die süddeutsche â-Aussprache von *schalet* darstellt.

Für den Romanisten ist die bisherige Etymologie ganz unannehmbar: von den ital. Wörtern mit *k*-Anlaut führt überhaupt kein Weg zu den mit (t)*sch*-anlautenden jüdischdeutschen Wörtern,¹ andererseits ist *chauld* zwar (wie die *Univ. Jewish Encycl.* richtig sagt) eine mittelfranzösische Schreibung des Wortes für

¹ Man könnte höchstens an das aus dem Afrz. entlehnte ital. *cialda* 'eine Art Teig' denken, aber wie sollte der Anfang des Wortes sich erklären? Andererseits gibt es ein frz. *chaudelait*, älter *chaudelet* 'Aniskuchen' (REW s. v. *caldus*), aber dies müsste ein yidd. **tschadlet* oder **tschodlet* geben, mit einem -d-, das nicht ohne weiteres verschwinden könnte.

'warm,' das altfrz. *chaut* (mit č-) und neufrz. *chaud* (mit š-) heisst, aber nie ist seit altfrz. Zeit das *-l-* gesprochen worden (schon im *Roland* ist *l* + Kons. verstummt) und die Epenthese von *-e-* ist eine weitere Schwierigkeit. Wir müssen uns also nach einem altfrz. Wort umsehen, das ein *lautendes -l-* und ein *-e-* enthält. Offenbar ist bei der Etymologie (*t*)*schale(n)t* = frz. *chaud* der Gedanke massgebend gewesen, dass die Hauptfunktion dieses Gerichts: am Sabbath warmzubleiben, in der Namengebung sich ausdrücken müsse—aber wer mit historischer Semantik vertraut ist, weiss wie trügerisch dies Kriterium sich oft erweist, indem ganz andere Merkmale als die heute vorherrschenden zur Zeit der Namengebung die Sprachgemeinschaft beeindruckt haben können.

Nachdem so der Weg zu einer neuen altfranzösischen Etymologie freigemacht ist, bietet sich mir das frz. *échalotte* 'eine Zwiebelart (*cepa ascalonica*).’ Über die Geschichte dieses Worts orientieren am besten Kluge-Götze s. v. *Schalotte* und von Wartburg's *Franz. etym. Wörterbuch* s. v. *ascalonia* 'schalotte.' Der letztere bringt die altfranz. Form *eschaloigne*, ferner mittelfranzösische Formen *échalette* (15 Jh.) und *échalotte* (seit Anfang des 16 Jh.), endlich mundartliche *chalotte*, *charlote* (unter dem Einfluss des Personennamens *Charlotte* stehend) und schreibt über die Geschichte der Wortfamilie: "*Ascalonia* ist die weibl. form des adj. *ascalonius*, das vom namen der stadt *Ascalon* abgeleitet ist. *Cepa ascalonia* findet sich bei Columella als name einer art zwiebel, die wohl von der genannten stadt nach dem westen gekommen ist. . . . Bereits Plinius nennt die pflanze bloss *ascalonia* . . . a- muss schon in lt. Zeit geschwunden sein; auf **scalonia* weisen auch it. *scalogno*, piem. *scalo(r)gna*, sp. *escalona* zurück. . . . Der suffw. [= Suffizwechsel] von *-ogne* > *-ette*-, *-otte* reihte das wort unter die diminutiva ein. Der anlass dazu war wohl, dass *eschaloigne* volksetymologisch mit *skala* . . . [= 'Schale'] in verbindung gebracht wurde. Die schriftsprache trug sodann das wort in der neuen form durch ganz Frankreich in die benachbarten germanischen gebiete hinaus." "Das Wort ist zweimal aus Frankreich in die benachbarten germanischen gebiete übergegangen: ahd. *asclouh* . . . , nhd. *aschlauch*, engl. *scallion* . . . Aus nfr. *échalotte* stammen sodann nhd. *schalotte*, zuerst (Elsass 16 Jh.) in den formen *schelot*, *schelet*, die als 'schale der baumfrüchte, der zwiebel usw.' definiert werden. Diese bed., die deutlich semantische anlehnung an *schale* zeigt, eignet

auch dem oberhess. *schlotte* 'blatt der zwiebel.' *Schalott* in der bed. des fr. *échalotte* ist els. und lothrd. [= lothringisch-deutsch]. Aus diesem ferner ndl. *sjalot*, engl. *shallot*." Nichts steht also im Wege, das yiddische Wort (t)*schale*(n)t an mfrz. *échalette*, *échalotte* anzuknüpfen, cf. elsässisch (des 16. Jh. s) *schelot*, *schelet*—da die *Univ. Jewish Enc.* uns mitteilt, dass das *Shalet* im Elsass *guesetzt* heisst, l. c. 347 [= dtsch. *gesetzt*, wie in 'der Teig, Kuchen hat sich gesetzt'), dürfen wir vielleicht annehmen dass diese neuere Bezeichnung sich eingebürgert hat, weil *shalet* in Elsass wie in frz. Dialekten semantisch unter den Einfluss von *Schale* geraten war. Das sekundäre -n- ist nicht auffälliger als lt. *focacia* > ahd. *fochanza*, *bratlea* > germ. **warantia* (> frz. *garance*) 'Färber-röte' (REW, 9501a), vgl. auch ahd. *pfalanza*, nhd. *faulenzen*.

Aber wie erklärt sich der semantische Übergang *échalotte* 'Zwiebel, Schalotte' > yidd. (t)*schalet*, Name des Sabbath-Gerichts? Man kann daran anknüpfen, dass, wie die obigen Angaben lehren, der Hauptbestandteil des *shalet*, die *Kiskhe*, mit Zwiebel angemacht ist—es wäre ja nicht der einzige Fall dass eine Speise nach einem Hauptingrediens oder -gewürz benannt ist, vgl. frz. *civet de lièvre* 'Hasenpfeffer,' von dem *cepa* 'Zwiebel,' das *ascalonia* 'Zwiebel' so nahe steht (*civet* heisst sekundär jedes 'Ragoût'), und eng. *gravy*, wenn man meine in *MLN* geäußerte Vermutung annimmt. In diese Richtung weist die Angabe bei Martin und Lienhart s. v. *Schalott*: 'Art kleiner Zwiebel, bes. zum Hammelsschlegel verwendet.' Ich muss aber auch noch darauf aufmerksam machen dass der im Reich sonst *Scheiterhaufen* heissende Apfelkoch (der aus Brotschnitten, Rosinen, Eiern und Äpfeln besteht und im Ofen krustig gebacen wird) in Österreich *Äpfelcharlotten* heisst, welches Wort offenbar die auch in Frankreich anzutreffende Nebenform von (é)*chalotte*: *charlotte* enthält.² Diese Parallele würde nahelegen dass *schalet* seine Bdtg. von 'mit Zwiebel angemachtes Gericht, das aus verschiedenen Ingredientien besteht,' zu 'jedes im Ofen gebackene Gericht aus verschiedenen Ingredientien,' ob nun Fleischgericht oder süsse Speise, verlagert hat, wobei die Idee des Warmbleibens jedenfalls vollkommen auszuschalten ist. So ist denn tatsächlich

² Cf. engl. *charlotte*, 1855 belegt.

(t)*schalet* ein alter Gallizismus (die *tsch*- Aussprache weist auf mhd. Zeit hin, cf. mhd. *tschapel* > fr. *chapeau* mit *č*-³), aber das Etymon ist ein anderes afz. Wort als das bisher angenommene.

LEO SPITZER

The Johns Hopkins University

TURLUPIN

Nous sommes bien informés sur l'histoire de ce mot, non pas sur son étymologie. Livet, *Lexique de la langue de Molière*, s. v. *turlupin*, nous dit:

Il y a deux phases dans l'histoire du mot Turlupin; dans la première, qui remonte au XIV^e siècle, il s'agit d'une secte politico-religieuse, qui avait voulu instituer la 'fraternité des pauvres'; c'étaient des cyniques 'suscitantes de nuditate pudendorum et publico coitu,' au dire de Gembrard, dans sa Chronologie. Ils furent brûlés vifs en 1362. Voir les *Origines de Ménage* . . . et le *Glossaire* de Ducange, v^o *Turlupini*. . .

Dans la seconde phase, *Turlupin* rappelle un bouffon de l'hôtel de Bourgogne, Henri Legrand, dit Belleville, dont le nom de théâtre était Turlupin. C'est lui qui mit à la mode ces mauvaises pointes, ces faux bons mots qu'on appela *turlupinades*.

Parmi les données de Livet sur la première phase, celle de *Turlupini* 'hérétiques,' il y a deux passages du P. Garasse, qui parle des 'Caignards ou Turlupins, qui vaquoient sous pretexte de charité, à d'étranges et horribles sodomies,' des 'Vaudois, . . . Caignards, Turlupins ou Bougres (car ils s'appelloient de tous ces noms . . .),' et en effet dans DuCange il y a une mention, datée 1374, d'un frère de 'l'Ordre des Freres Pescheurs, Inquisiteur des *Bougres*,' qui aurait poursuivi 'les Turlupins et Turlupines.'

Tandis que nos dictionnaires étymologiques modernes (Bloch, Dauzat, Gamillscheg) considèrent le mot d'origine inconnue, Sainéan, *Les sources indigènes de l'étymologie française* I, 213, donne l'explication suivante: après avoir parlé du transfert de sens *flûter* 'jouer de flûte' > 'boire,' il écrit:

³ So muss denn die Umprägung *eschaloigne* > *eschalette*, -otte in afz. Zeit hinaufreichen und das yiddische Wort gestattet uns, hinter die urkundliche Bezeugung (15. Jh.) zurückzugreifen.

C'est à cette notion de jouer de la flûte, pour boire excessivement, que paraissent remonter les termes vulgaires anciens *tureluper*, à côté de *turelurer* et *tureluter*, proprement flûter et boire à longs traits, pendants des synonymes *churluper* (Oudin), *churlurer* (Gautier de Coincy) et *churluter*, formes contaminées . . . [que Sainéan traite II, 328, et explique par un chevauchement *churler* + *turluper*]. Le nom énigmatique de *turlupins*, donné aux membres d'une secte cynique pendant le XIV^e siècle, semble se rattacher à une de ces métaphores bachiques de l'ancienne langue vulgaire. La variante *tirelupin* est seule connue de Rabelais, qui donne ce nom à un des sommeliers de Grandgousier (I. IV, ch. LXV) : il faisait boire les domestiques de son maître avant qu'ils eussent soif. Dérivé de *tureluper* ou *tireluper*, boire excessivement, le nom de *turelupin* ou *tirelupin* désignerait un biberon, une crapule, un cynique. Ce nom est devenu au XV^e siècle le type de l'hypocrite, dans Villon :

1159. Aux dévots et aux Beguines,
Tant Turlupins que Turlupines . . .

et au XVI^e siècle, Rabelais le donne aux moines vagabonds et dissolus [note: Voir, à ce sujet, *La langue de Rabelais*, t. II, p. 268].

Je crois que Sainéan a eu raison de faire appel à une racine **turelup-* indiquant comme *turelure* etc. le son de la flûte, mais qu'il a fait fausse route au point de vue sémantique.

Et d'abord, il faudra écarter le *churlupper* 'boire copieusement' d'Oudin (1640), qui ne sera autre chose qu'une variante de *siroter* *siroper* (XVII^e s.), tiré de *sirop* ou de ses variantes, tous dérivés de l'arabe, cf. prov. mod. *sourroupa*, *fourroupa* 'siroter.' Ensuite, il n'y a pas, au moins à ma connaissance, de *tureluper*, *tireluper* ancien, attesté au sens de 'jouer de la flûte'—Sainéan était malheureusement très enclin à donner une réalité *historique* factice à ses suppositions théoriques—; les seuls indices de l'existence de ce radical est le dérivé *turlupet* 'orgues dans les églises placées dans le garatas [sic]. Inusité; de *turluper*, imiter le son du flageolet' que nous attestent Verrier-Onillon pour l'Anjou. Admettons donc de bonne grâce un **turlup-* (à côté de *turlut-*) 'jouer du flageolet.'¹

¹ Le -p final peut s'expliquer dans des onomatopées, cf. p. ex. le mot roman *faluppa* d'origine évidemment onomatopéique (> a. fr. *voloper* 'envelopper,' de là le suffixe du verbe a. fr. *hureper*, norm. *hérupé*, *hurepé* 'hérissé' [dit des cheveux ou poils]) ou le 'mot huntus' a. fr. *tproupt* (Nyrop, Gramm. hist. III, 30). M. Puscariu, *Etudes de linguistique roumaine* (1937), p. 338, a montré que les occlusives à la fin des racines onomatopéiques sont destinées à indiquer un bruit saccadé, subit, énergique et bref (au théâtre, *pss!* indique une imposition de silence général, *pst!* une exclamation indignée provoquée par tel bruit particulier; *chut!*,

Mais, ce qui me semble grave, c'est que les hérétiques appelés *turlupins* ou *bougres* ou *cagnards* au XIV^e siècle ont été inculpés de sodomie, non de saoulerie: ils prêchaient que rien de naturel n'est honteux (Littre) et, par conséquent, forniquaient en public (v. *supra*). Il faudra donc partir d'un sens obscène: les Turlupins et les Turlupines s'adonnaient plutôt aux plaisirs de Vénus qu'à ceux de Bacchus. Le synonyme *cagnard* se ressent du péché de la paillardise (de *cagne* 'chienne,' puis 'prostituée').

Or, si nous parcourons l'étude de Thureau sur les refrains français (*Der Refrain in der franz. Chanson*, Berlin 1901, p. 119 seq.), nous sommes frappés par le caractère obscène de certains des refrains censés imiter le son de la flûte. Le passage du *Virgile travesti* de Scarron est connu:

Lanturelu!

Ce mot, au langage vulgaire,
Veut dire: allez vous faire faire;
Je ne saurais honnestement
Vous l'expliquer plus clairement,

mais voici aussi une chanson populaire (d'après Rollland I, 180):

Mon berger n'a rien qu'une flûte
Pour nous faire—*turlututu*,
Pour nous faire—lan la dériette,
Pour nous faire danser.

Ajoutons encore le passage de l'*Anc. théâtre fr.*, IX, 183: 'La bianté a grand pouvoir / Sur le péché de *turelure*' (= 'paillardise') / L'autre jour. . . J'aperceus venir vers moy / De mes amours la portraiture, / Et je senty incontinent / Trebouiller madame Nature'; dans Godefroy, s. vv. *turelure* et *turlurete* il y a deux passages où un mari trompé est appelé *Robin Turelure*, *Jennin Turelurette*

zut! sont des injonctions brusques). Le -t n'est pas seul à indiquer par l'occlusion déterminée un bruit bref et énergique: "Il va du: soi," dit M. P., "que la consonne qui interrompt brusquement une interjection n'est pas forcément t, mais peut être toute autre consonne occlusive. Chez les Turcs par exemple, qui prononcent l'h pharyngal, c'est un *ahk* qui correspond à notre [roum.] *ah*t ('soupir') . . . après r il semble par fois qu'il puisse naître un p, comme [en roum.] *harp* (à côté de *har*) qui est expliqué comme 'le bruit qu'on fait en avalant d'un coup et vite'—*tirelup* est exactement dans la même situation que le roum. *harp* (-p après r [+l]) et le plus fréquent *turlut-* est dans la même que *pet- chut- t zut*, roum. *ah*t.

(dans l'un il est dit *expressis verbis* que les amoureux de sa femme avaient accompli 'le deduit de nature'). Le refrain *lanlaire* lui-même rimant avec *se faire faire*, indique le procédé qui se cache derrière ces allusions: ces expressions sont—chose curieuse!—à l'origine des *euphémismes*. Nous pouvons nous imaginer, à l'origine, le dialogue suivant entre Robin et sa femme: 'Que vous ont-ils fait?'—'Turlututu (lanturelu, lanlaire)!', le son imitant la flûte indiquant un rien, une quantité négligeable, insignifiante, soluble dans l'air comme le son de la flûte (cf. l'exclamation *flûte!* elle-même, si fréquente dans le langage populaire français, et le prov. mod. *me fai autant coume tararo* 'cela m'est indifférent'). C'est à dire l'onomatopée indiquant une chose insignifiante serait une tentative de 'minimiser' les faits.² Mais cette onomatopée révélerait aussi le fait qui devrait être caché, car *turlure* et congénères doivent avoir aussi exprimé l'acte amoureux (métaphore tirée du 'jeu de flûte'), cf. Deschamps (passage cité par Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye): 'Marion, entendez à moi . . . d'humble cœur vous pri / Qu'as dessoubz de votre sainture / Me laissez *de la turlure* / Et de ma chevrete *jouer*.' Les deux constatations opposées que je viens de faire ne s'excluent nullement: l'euphémisme populaire, contrairement à ce qu'en pensent la plupart des linguistes, ne fait pas que cacher, il tend aussi fortement à *révéler*, dans une sorte d'inconséquence enfantine, ce qui devrait être caché: comment expliquerait-on autrement la réintroduction de formes du verbe fr. *f* . . . dans *ficher* qui devrait le remplacer (part. *fichu*, inf. *fiche*) ou l'apparition des consonnes *-ch-* et *-n-* dans l'imprécation espa-

² Le refrain, grâce à l'idée de la gaité légère avec laquelle le son de la flûte semble s'évaporer dans l'air, peut très bien évoquer un tour de magie bien réussi: ainsi dans un passage de J. Romain, *Les hommes de bonne volonté* xvii, 147, un jeune intellectuel, 'apprenti magicien' comme il s'appelle lui-même, s' imagine pouvoir échapper à la police, en transportant ailleurs, d'une façon magique, une partie de son moi, en opérant ce qu'il appelle une 'fuite par l'intérieur': "Et vous n'emmènerez au commissariat qu'une loque, un fantoche, un polichinelle en veston. L'autre cher petit, moi gambadera sur le Pont National et se tirera des flûtes vers les banlieues. Loin des oiseaux, des troupeaux, des villageoises . . . des mouches, des vaches, des substituts, *turlututus*. . ." Il est évident qu'ici le refrain, rimant plaisamment avec *substituts* [sc. du procureur général], indique la légèreté papillonnante d'un être qui se joue des autorités. Le verbe *turlupiner* 'harasser' (p. ex. *une idée me turlupine*, synonyme de *trouble, tracasse, tarabuste*) a un sématisme connu dans les termes obscènes (cf. all. *kujonieren*, *buserieren*, etc.).

gnole *por bichenés* . . . (euphémisme pour *por vida* [*de Cristo*]) qui viennent d'autres mots tabous (*bicho* au sens 'diable'; *demonio* > *demonche*)? Le sujet parlant agit comme l'enfant, qui, pris en flagrant délit, exhibe sa mauvaise conscience en ne cachant le corpus delicti qu'à moitié. C'est ainsi que les euphémismes populaires deviennent des allusions les plus claires possibles ou, autrement dit, se révèlent inefficaces à la longue (et doivent être remplacés à leur tour par d'autres expressions, également inefficaces)—d'autant plus que le sens sous-jacent est compris correctement par toute la communauté. Nous comprenons maintenant comment les *turlupins* (et les *turlupines*) purent être désignés par un terme nettement obscène d'après leur pratique du 'naturel' en matière de sexe. Chez Villon et Rabelais le sens originaire est déjà perdu: le *turlupin* est alors un 'mauvais bougre' quelconque, soit hypocrite, soit paillard (soit même buveur), ou tout simplement un gueux, un souffreteux—du moment que la secte n'existait plus!

LEO SPITZER

THE USE OF LATIN IN THE *VITA NUOVA*

Ego tanquam centrum circuli cui simili modo se habent circumferentie partes; tu autem non sic. If Love's sighs and tears in Chapter XII are, along with the words he speaks to the poet, prophetic of Beatrice's early death (as I shall assume already to have demonstrated in another essay),¹ then we can now observe a use of Latin in this scene and elsewhere in the book with better understanding. These words about the center of a circle explain why Love is weeping. That is how they are an answer to the poet's question. They say that, being a God, Love can see into the future. The poet-protagonist and the reader both will only later understand why Love has wept before he uttered them.²

But every reader will recall that Love does not continue speaking Latin. Nor is that language what might be called his usual medium of communication with the poet. Here in this second vision, after the words about the circle, the poet, puzzled, asks what

¹ *Vita Nuova XII: Love's Obscure Words in Romanic Review*, xxvi (April, 1945), pp. 89-102.

² My argument here is the subject of the essay cited.

they can mean. But Love shifts language here. The change from Latin to Italian is indeed explicit in the text: "E quelli mi dicea *in parole volgari*: Non dimandare più che utile ti sia." Thus, to those four questions which in the former essay I have listed as those which any adequate interpretation of this episode must answer we must add yet a fifth: Why this change of language? And what are its implications in a larger sense?²

- ² They are: 1) Why is it time for Love and the poet to put aside their pretenses (. . . tempus est ut pretermittantur simulacra nostra).
 2) Why does Love begin to weep?
 3) How are Love's words about the center of a circle a reply to that question?
 4) Why would it not be good for the poet to understand those words?

It is indeed surprising that so many of the standard commentaries to the *Vita Nuova* avoid the fifth question. In those which do attempt to give an explanation of it, one meets the very strange suggestion that, even though Dante understands Latin, yet part of the obscurity of what Love says to him may be due to the fact that his words are in a language not so familiar. Does this astounding point of view begin with Witte (*La Vita Nuova*, Leipzig, 1876, p. 24) whose note on the change in language reads: "Da ora innanzi Amore lascia il parlare latino e, forse per evitare il rimprovero di troppa oscurità, non si serve più che della lingua volgare"? D'Ancona's commentary (*La Vita Nuova*, Pisa, 1884, p. 88) at any rate cites Witte's note and adds: "Noi consentiamo col Carducci contro il Giuliani che l'oscurità notata da Dante fosse nella sentenza non nella lingua. Pur tuttavia può ammettersi che al discorso misterioso aggiungesse oscurità l'uso di una lingua, che, per quanto già nota a Dante, e da lui intesa, non era la favella usuale e quotidiana. Amore che gli suggerisce il rimedio al male occorso, si piega ora fino a Dante anche nell'adoperare una forma più piana e intelligibile di parlare." And this view is echoed by several later commentators, none of whom seems aware of what his assumptions by such a view must be, namely, that this is a biographical document and that there is no intention of an author here at all: "Love just simply spoke this way and that is that." Scherillo's note (*La Vita Nuova ed il Canzoniere*, Milano, 1930, p. 106) is a fair example (his note is to the words *in parole volgari* of the text): "Non più in latino; e forse per riuscir più latino! In quel tempo anche a Dante 'era malagevole d'intendere li versi latini.' . . ." Flamini (*La Vita Nuova*, Livorno, 1917, p. 24) is not guilty in the same terms, but this "documentary" view is still very much with him when he suggests that the poet cannot yet understand the philosophy which Love is expressing: "Della filosofia neanche il linguaggio capisce; tanto che per dargli utilmente consigli, Amore prosegue 'in parole volgari.'"

In his very interesting *Bemerkungen zu Dantes Vita Nuova* (Istanbul,

I wish to suggest that it is only by the view which I have before proposed of the prophetic nature of Love's acts and words (in Latin) in Chapter XII that we can see the shift in language on the part of Love for what it really is. If this prove true, it is therefore the only view that can adequately answer all five of the questions which arise. I mean that only by seeing that the acts and words of Love in this scene (before the change in language) constitute something of the nature of an oracle are we prepared to see a reason for the change from Latin to Italian there.

An oracle, the pronouncement of an oracle, needs a place apart or something to distinguish it from ordinary utterance. The many ancient oracles in verse (and no doubt chanted: *horrendas canit ambages*) are witness to this need. The verse and chant raised them, obviously, above the ordinary level of everyday utterance. Now Love's words in the first part of the vision of Chapter XII are, I propose, put in Latin for a quite similar reason. The language, in this case, is the sign of another higher level of meaning in the

1937, Offprint of *Publications de la faculté des lettres de l'Université d'Istanbul*, pp. 162-208), Professor Leo Spitzer has come much closer to the views I here advance, being first of all, of course, in no way a party to this documentary approach to a work of art; and specifically by remarking on what amounts to two levels of utterance in Chapter XII: "Amor spricht Latein, wo er die Stellung des Menschen definiert, Italienisch, wo er auf die besondere Liebessituation des Dichters eingeht. Es wäre ganz stilwidrig, wenn diese geheimnisvollen, in der Sprache der Kirche mehr ver— als enthüllten Wahrheiten, denen gegenüber das Fragen als unnütz abgewehrt wird, Anspielungen auf 'die Lieben' Dantes enthielten." I think Spitzer's reason for the shift in language here entirely mistaken because he has not recognized the prophetic nature of Love's tears and words; but I acknowledge the correctness of his feeling about the transcendental level of utterance here. His passing suggestion, moreover, that the language of the Church counts for something in the background here, seems well worth consideration.

Spitzer's note is a reply to what Professor J. E. Shaw had written on this episode in his *Essays on the Vita Nuova*, Princeton, 1929, pp. 77-99. If Shaw has anywhere attempted to account for the shift in language in this episode, it has quite eluded me. But the idea that Love, while he speaks in Latin, is aloof from the poet and on another plane is evidently quite opposed to Shaw's view that in those very words Love has at last most intimately revealed the fact that he is none other than Dante's own true love for Beatrice. To this in his interpretation Spitzer has, I think, quite rightly objected. I cannot, in fact, see how Professor Shaw can account for the shift from Latin in this scene and make his account agree with his general interpretation of the episode.

words pronounced. Many readers, no doubt, have sensed that something of the kind was true. One feels quite distinctly that when Love has shifted to Italian here he has stepped *down* from somewhere to the level of the poet and to more ordinary affairs. The tone is changed. And looking back to where Love was as long as he spoke Latin here, one feels, I think, that he had stood upon a kind of stage transcending that level on which Italian is now spoken. Love was acting out an oracle. We see this if we understand the oracle. His tears and sighs and words had more than ordinary meaning. The Latin was there to signify a level of appearance, set apart, as on a stage, a place where more than ordinary meaning is possible.

But Love, one easily objects, is not the only character who speaks Latin in the *Vita Nuova*. There are the *spiriti*, for instance, of Chapter II. Beatrice had appeared before the poet's eyes and then his *spirito della vita*, his *spirito animale* and his *spirito naturale* all "speak a piece" in Latin.⁴ What then of this? The same, I think. Again the Latin serves to build a kind of transcendental level. For these words too in Latin are oracular in a sense. The real meaning of what the *spiriti* say is not at the time obscure, nor is it of the future only like the later signs of Beatrice's death. But their pronouncements do transcend the moment and look toward the future and the moment is portentous. The poet, after all, is only nine years old!

One need not take into account the other instances of Latin in the *Vita Nuova* except the words of Love in Chapter III, because the use of Latin elsewhere is for quite other reasons explained by the context.⁵ The word *Incipit* of the rubric of the Book of Memory, for instance, is quite naturally demanded and explained by the image of the Book itself. The solemn words from Jeremiah (*Quomodo sedet sola civitas*, etc.) come in for reasons accounted for. It is there, in fact, that the author makes it clear that neither

⁴ Spitzer (*op. cit.*, p. 173) has remarked on the Latin of the three *spiriti* with another interest, namely, to observe what *kind* of Latin it is; and while I am not sure of the comic intention which he finds, for instance, in the Latin of the *Spirito naturale*, I can share his sense of the somewhat theatrical atmosphere here, as my interpretation of a "stage" created by the Latin indicates.

⁵ I refer to the passages in Latin such as the *Vos omnes qui transitis*, etc., *Nomina sunt consequentia rerum*, or the closing words of the book, none of which are *spoken* by a character and obviously are not part of the use of Latin I am considering.

he nor his first friend for whom he writes this book intended that it should be in any language but Italian.⁶ That is why he gives no more than this of Jeremiah's words. Nothing is said about the Latin spoken by the God of Love or by the *spiriti*. That simply is the way the Book of Memory reads which he is copying. Thus, the reason for the use of Latin in these episodes can be clear to us only from an awareness of the author's intention in his creation; and were that intention not deliberately pointed to, as it is in Chapter XII, by an explicit shift within the same scene from one language to another, we might not grasp it in the other scenes where this is not the case. But, having grasped it there, we know that, looking back, when Love in his first apparance as a person in Chapter III is heard to say: *Ego dominus tuus* and *Vide cor tuum*, the Latin is there telling us that he is speaking from a level where *acts* as well as *words* can be prophetic. It is, in fact, an act and not a word that holds the sign; for when Love goes off weeping to Heaven with the lady in his arms, that is the sign. Again in XII it is Love's weeping actually that is the sign. The words, being in Latin, affirm the stage whereon the sign can be a sign. We must speak of two levels of appearance in the *Vita Nuova*.⁷

C. S. SINGLETON

* . . . E se alcuno volesse me riprendere di ciò, ch'io non scrivo qui le parole che seguitano a quelle allegate [*Quomodo sedet*, etc.], escusomene, però che lo intendimento mio non fue dal principio di scrivere altro che per volgare; onde, con ciò sia cosa che le parole che seguitano a quelle che sono allegate, siano tutte latine, sarebbe fuori del mio intendimento se le scrivessi. E simile intenzione so ch'ebbe questo mio primo amico a cui io ciò scrivo, cioè ch'io li scrivessi solamente volgare.

⁷ This dual level of appearance for the God of Love, the fact that he can stand and act and speak on two distinct planes should in itself warn the critic of the *Vita Nuova* not to judge his character (which is one of *persona*) naturalistically. He is no ordinary character. He has not even the relatively consistent psychology of the protagonist (who also can be thought of too *naturally*). Love's character lies between the fact that on the one hand he is a God and on the other he can be "liquidated" by Chapter XXV—as a person. I make this remark especially because one friend, a well-known dantista, has written to me protesting that since Love in Chapter XXIV is very gay, it cannot be that, as I had maintained, Love knew in Chapter XII that Beatrice was soon to die; that is, in other words, that knowing this in Chapter XII, Love should have been sad thereafter. But Love has not this density or natural continuity of character. In XII he is acting out an oracle when he weeps for Beatrice's approaching death and we are not to expect him to keep on acting once he is no longer on the level (the "stage") of oracle.

VILLON'S ADVERSARY

It seems not to have been recognized, I think, that Villon hated one of his legatees, Perrenet Marchant, Bastard de la Barre, with exceptional animosity. This man, a *sergent à verge*, is mentioned four times in the *Lais* and *Testament*, oftener indeed than any other legatee except the poet's faithless lady. He also has the signal distinction of being the one person unforgivingly recalled when Villon, in speaking of "certains laiz" made in the year 1456 which he does not intend to revoke, specifically adds:

De pitié ne suis refroidis
Envers le Bastart de la Barre. (T. 763-64)

Moreover Perrenet is left not one but two separate bequests in the *Testament* (765-68; 1094-1101) besides the one left him in the *Lais* (177-184). Twice Villon associates this man with the performance of the *amoureux mestier*, remarking in the *Lais* that he knows no other. And this is the messenger that Villon selects (T. 937) to bear an insulting bequest to his "damoiselle au nez tortu."

Now it is usually believed that the women mentioned by Villon fall into two categories, some woman he seriously loved who made him suffer, and the lighter variety, of little significance to him, like Marion l'Idolle, Jehanneton, la Grosse Margot, etc. His faithless lady used to be identified with Katherine de Vausselles, but Charlier, Foulet and Champion more plausibly assume that the woman who in both the *Lais* and *Testament* appears after the legacies to Villon's protector and mother must have been the one who occupied a special place in his emotions.¹ She is called "ma

¹ For proof in detail see G. Charlier, *Archivum Romanicum* iv, 1920, 506-17 and L. Foulet in *Medieval Studies in Memory of Gertrude Schoepperle Loomis*, Paris and New York, 1927, 368 ff. Cf. also P. Champion, *François Villon*, 2nd ed. Paris, 1933, II, 1 ff. and 327; Siciliano, *François Villon*, Paris, 1934, 87 ff. Foulet thinks the name of the lady was Rose and that Marthe replaced her in the poet's affections, but "rose" was probably "du style" as Longnon, Charlier, Champion and Siciliano assume. Siciliano rejects the notion of Villon as an "amant martyr" as well as any division of Villon's love into "light" and "serious," believing all the women in his life were of a low class. But this does not preclude the possibility that the poet truly cared for one of them and was hurt by her loss. As Charlier

chiere rose" in T. 910 and some critics have thought this was her name. It seems more probable, however, that her name was Marthe, the name in the acrostic of the ballade he sends her. It is quite possible that Villon had some sort of affair with Katherine as well as Marthe, not to mention his more ephemeral passions.² Nevertheless Marthe seems to be the woman he reproaches in both his major poems with faithlessness and with driving him into exile.

In the *Lais* this sweetheart is described as holding him in an amorous prison, deceiving him, being *felonne et dure*, causing him to flee, and she is left his enshrined heart. But in the *Testament* his hurt is obviously deeper and his words harsher.³ He will leave her neither heart nor liver because she would prefer something else; the "something else" is equivocally indicated, and Villon hopes the man who gives it to her may be hung. The charge of promiscuity is explicit. Instead of his heart Villon bequeaths her a ballade with every rhyme-word ending in the grating letter of betrayal, a ballade in which her false beauty, hypocritical sweetness, cruel charm and eyes without pity are blamed for his undoing and his flight, and in which he taunts her, his dear rose, with the day when her full-blown loveliness will wither and fade.⁴ But Villon's

says (*op. cit.*, 517): "il faut se sentir bien épris [he might have added: et profondément blessé] pour mettre pareille énergie dans une profession d'indifférence!"

² Since Katherine is mentioned in a ballade on the ills of love (T. 625 ff.), some sort of love-affair is implied, but it hardly seems to have been serious and Villon is obviously smarting from a beating rather than a broken heart in T. 657 ff. That the beating rankled is also evident from the legacy to Noel Jolis, who probably administered it, of a *quid pro quo*, namely 220 blows at the hand of the public whipper (T. 1636 ff.).

³ See *Lais* 15 ff., 25 ff., 33 ff., 41 ff., 73 ff.; T. 910 ff. Although Champion connects T. 673 ff. with Katherine, I believe these lines also refer to Marthe: *celle que jadis servois* seems to be the same person as *celle que j'ai dit*, the lady who drove him away and was bequeathed his *cuer enchassé* in the *Lais* (73 ff.) but who in the *Testament* is left *ne cuer ne foye* (T. 911).

⁴ In both the *Lais* and the *Testament* Villon blames this woman for his undoing and his flight. Cf. T. 945, *de ma desfaçon seur* with *Lais* 19, *consentant a ma desfaçon*, and T. 953, *trotter m'en fault en fuyte et deshonneur*, with *Lais* 42, *mon mieulx est, ce croy, de fouir*. I do not believe Villon went to Angers because of unrequited love (see *MLN*, XLVII, 1932, 154 ff.), but it is possible that the demands of his lady caused him to commit certain robberies, that he got into trouble to satisfy her, or thought he did, or wanted her to think that he did.

crowning insult to his "dameiselle au nez tortu" is to send her his poem by Perrenet de la Barre with the injunction that this fellow ask her whence she comes and address her as "orde paillarde."

Why does Villon link this man with his false lady? Why does he hate him so much? Champion thought the Bastard de la Barre was "un excellent ami" of Villon's (*op. cit.*, I, 184-85). Both he and Siciliano see, however, that the "orde paillarde" must have had some connection with him (Siciliano, *op. cit.*, 343). Is it not very likely that Perrenet supplanted Villon in her affections, that this explains Villon's venom, his references to the man as a "tres bon marchand" who knows only how to make love, his bequests to him of straw to spread on the floor while he performs *l'amoureux mestier* and of old mats to hold him in and keep him steady on his feet?⁵ Villon's final bequest to this unsavory individual includes three loaded dice, a sharper's deck of cards, and, in certain obscene circumstances, a dose of quartan fever. Obviously he was no "excellent ami," but a man Villon wished to brand as a crook and whoremonger. It seems psychologically improbable that Villon would have associated such a dirty knave with his faithless sweetheart unless the man were already connected with her. I suggest therefore that Perrenet was Villon's successful rival and that some of Villon's special bitterness in losing his lady, the hurt to his pride as well as his heart, derived from the character of the man to whom she turned.

GRACE FRANK

Bryn Mawr College

AN ANALOGUE OF *L'ERMITE* IN *ZADIG*

In *La Poésie française du Moyen Age*¹ Gaston Paris devotes a chapter, *L'Ange et l'ermite*, to an examination of the sources of the incidents Voltaire recounts in chap. XX, *L'Ermite*, of *Zadig*. In his critical commentary on *Zadig* M. Georges Ascoli² has hardly gone beyond elaborating the researches of Gaston Paris. After the

⁵ On *tenir serre* (T. 767) see Cotgrave s. v. *tenir*, Thuasne's ed. II, 234, and a similar suggestion of incontinence in T. 1100.

¹ I, 131-87.

² *Zadig*, édité par Georges Ascoli, Soc. des Textes français modernes.

latter's exhaustive labors there remained little to glean. He had traced Zadig's adventures in chap. xx through the English of Parnell's *Hermit*, through Latin and French mediaeval versions, to Arabic and finally to a presumptive Hebrew original. Chapter xx does not stand alone as a debt *Zadig* owes to rabbinic literature. The celebrated narrative in chap. III, *Le Chien et le cheval*, which Huxley considered the progenitor of the modern detective story of deductive reasoning, goes back similarly to a talmudic source.³ Voltaire was no doubt quite unaware that he was indebted to a literature he despised for the most striking parts of his *Zadig*.

Chapter xx, *L'Ermite*, in *Zadig* relates the actions of the hermit, which appear to Zadig unaccountable and abominable until he learns that the hermit is in reality carrying out God's purposes in accordance with divine justice and providence, although in ways inscrutable to men. Gaston Paris traced the ancestry of *L'Ermite* to its oldest recorded source. The rabbinic tale he unearthed is not, however, the only one, nor the oldest recorded one, in which seemingly irrational acts are explained as springing from a deeper knowledge of the truth, unshared by mortals.

There is a series of tales in rabbinic literature centering about Solomon, about whom, as representing the highest attainment of their people in wisdom and grandeur, the Jewish fancy delighted to play.⁴ Some of these legendary tales were of a kind that later found a suitable setting in the *Thousand and One Nights*. Of such are some of those that deal with Solomon's relations with Asmodeus. To build the Temple Solomon required the *shamir*, a worm endowed with the property of cleaving whatever stone it rested on. Since only Asmodeus knew where it was to be found, Solomon sent Benaiah ben Jehoiada to capture the king of the demons. Benaiah succeeded by a stratagem in binding Asmodeus and forcing him to return with him to Solomon's court. It is at this point that we strike upon the theme that finds its counterpart in *Zadig*:

They reached a palm tree. Asmodeus rubbed against it and brought it to the ground. They came up to a house and Asmodeus made it tumble to the earth. They came up to a tent belonging to a widow; she came

³ *MLN.*, LII (1937), 576-7.

⁴ These tales are found almost in their entirety in Hebrew in *Sepher HaAgadah*, compiled by Ch. Bialik and Ch. N. Rabnitzky, Cracau, I, 103-113, and in full in Prof. Louis Ginzberg's *Legends of the Jews*, IV, 125-176.

out and pleaded with him. He turned away from her tent and broke a bone. He observed, "This is the import of the verse: 'And a soft tongue breaketh the bone.'"

He met a blind man who had strayed from his way, and brought him back to his road. He saw a drunken man who had lost his way and him too he led back to his road. He came upon a wedding party where there was a great deal of merry making. He wept. He heard a man say to a shoemaker, "Make me a pair of shoes that shall last me seven years." He burst out laughing. He saw a magician performing tricks of magic. He laughed again.

Benaiah does not immediately ask for an explanation of Asmodeus' strange behavior. That explanation comes many days later after their arrival in Jerusalem.

Benaiah said to Asmodeus, "What was your reason, when you saw the blind man straying, for leading him back to his road?" He answered, "They had pronounced in heaven that he is a man perfectly righteous and that anyone bringing him contentment would gain for himself eternal life."

"And for what reason, when you saw that drunken man straying, did you lead him back to his road?"

"They had pronounced in heaven that he is a thoroughly wicked man, and I brought him contentment so that he might consume his existence during his life on earth."

"Why did you weep when you saw the wedding party?"

"Because the bridegroom was destined to die in three days and his bride to wait thirteen years for her young brother-in-law."

"Why did you burst into laughter when you heard that man say to the shoemaker: 'Make me a pair of shoes to last seven years'?"

"He himself will not last out seven days⁵ and yet he required shoes to last seven years."

"Why did you laugh when you saw the magician performing his tricks of magic?"

"He was sitting just over a king's treasure. Let him with his magic arts find out what is lying under him."⁶

Unfortunately the demon's actions in overturning the palm tree and the house are left unexplained. There can be little doubt that there too, like the hermit in *Zadig*, the demon was acting in the light of knowledge not vouchsafed to ordinary mortals, since it is unlikely that feats so trivial would otherwise have been reported of the prince of demons.

⁵ The reading in *Sepher HaAgadah* is erroneously *seven years*. In the *Testament of Solomon* it is related that the demon Ornias who, like Asmodeus, learned from his visits to heaven the destinies of men, burst into laughter at the king for designing to condemn to death a youth who was fated to die in three days. The *Testament of Solomon* is assigned to a date not later than the third century.

⁶ Gittin, 67; *Sepher HaAgadah*, I, 111-112.

The earliest occurrence in literature of the legend used by Voltaire is found in the Koran, although it is beyond question that it goes back much farther. The legend of Asmodeus is recorded in the Talmud. The fortune of the former has deservedly been more brilliant, it deals with a question perpetually fresh for those who ponder on the accidents and misfortunes that befall the innocent, and it was especially dear to the Middle Ages with their fondness for moral tales. The legend of Asmodeus bears a structural resemblance to it; the mold is the same. But here, too, men are confronted with the truth that their present acts are incongruous, absurd, saddening, when viewed in the light of future events. The moral is driven home less obviously and sharply. Perhaps there is nothing incongruous and absurd in making of the demon a bearer of moral instruction to men.

H. Loss

Carleton College

STENDHAL'S "BALTIMORE INCIDENT." A CORRECTION

Ever since Stendhal told his story¹ of the soldier on guard duty at a Baltimore theater who became so excited during a performance of *Othello* in August, 1822, that he shot the actor playing the leading rôle as the latter was about to strangle Desdemona, it has been common practice to cite the "incident" as an outstanding illustration of the illusion of reality produced by drama at its best.

Recent investigation permits one to doubt the veracity of the "incident." Certainly it did not occur in August, 1822. The two Baltimore theaters were closed during that month. The "Baltimore Theatre" did not open for the fall season until September 23, 1822, when Mr. Mathews played in *A Trip to Paris*. It remained open until November 15, 1822.

In October, Booth came to the "Baltimore Theatre" and played, beginning October 21, in the following: *Richard III*; *Bertram*; *King Lear*; *The Iron Chest*; *Othello*; *A New Way to Pay Old Debts*; *Macbeth*; and *Hamlet*. The performance of *Othello* took place Monday night, October 28, 1822, without incident.²

¹ *Racine et Shakespeare*, 1823; p. 13 in Calmann-Lévy ed.

² *The Baltimore American and Commercial Daily Advertiser*,

Meanwhile, a rival theatre opened its doors for the winter season. The "New Theatre," as it was called, put on its *première*, October 30, 1822, and continued with performances until March 21, 1823. Its presentations were, almost entirely, light in quality, most of them being comedies and farces. It did not play *Othello*.

If we go back to the year 1821, we find that there was no "Othello incident" in Baltimore in that year. The spring season, 1822, of the "Baltimore Theatre" ran from April 26 to July 4. During this period several of Shakespeare's principal tragedies were performed, including *Richard III* which enjoyed great popularity with Romantic audiences. But *Othello* was not given. Neither was *Othello* performed in 1823 up to the time Stendhal wrote his famous passage.

Glancing at the theaters of other American cities of the time, we find the following information.

Othello was performed in Boston, May 13, 1822, by Booth and again, November 8, 1822, by Cooper, each time without an incident.³ It was performed in New York, October 13, 1821, by Booth, again February 12, 1822, and again, June 19, 1822, by Reed, each time without incident.⁴ It was performed in Washington, August 29, 1822, by Wilson, without incident,⁵ although the acting of Mr. Wheatley (of the Baltimore Theatre) in the rôle of Iago occasioned some severe criticism from the *Georgetown Metropolitan*.⁶

We conclude, then, that "the Baltimore incident" did not occur. Stendhal may have been misinformed. Or, a rumor, emanating from the hostile reception accorded the English players at Paris (August-September, 1822) may have served as the basis for an exaggerated *Othello* story whose locale was subsequently transposed to America, and to a city in America where tension between whites and negroes might conceivably be extreme.

C. WESLEY BIRD

Fresno State College

³ *The Boston Daily Advertiser*.

⁴ *The New York Evening Post*.

⁵ *The National Intelligencer*, semi-weekly.

⁶ As reported in *The Baltimore Patriot*, Sept. 4, 1822, p. 4.

THE ORIGIN OF THE NAME "RARAHU"

Pierre Loti (then known as Julien Viaud) visited Easter Island (l'Ile de Pâques) on January 3, 1872, as an *aspirant de première classe* on the French frigate, *la Flore*. Admiral T. de Lapelin was in command of the boat. The latter had orders from the French government to make a brief investigation of l'Ile de Pâques and Nuka-Hiva, before proceeding to Tahiti. His report was published in the *Revue maritime et coloniale*, November-December, 1872, along with sketches of native statues drawn by Viaud.

On January 6, the day before sailing away from Easter Island, Julien Viaud and his companions (Joseph Bernard and de la R...) took an unscheduled and hurried excursion to the famous crater of Rano-Raraku. This immense natural coliseum, scene of the massacre of the aborigines by the invading Peruvians, made a deep impression on Viaud. He wrote a description of it for the readers of *l'Illustration*.¹

In choosing a name for the composite feminine character of *Le Mariage de Loti*, 1880, Viaud had merely to change one letter in "Raraku" (the prefix "Rano" means "volcano") and the result was "Rarahu."

It should be noted, however, that Tregear² lists "rarahu" under two headings: 1. noun, variant of "rārauhē," "the common New Zealand fern (*Pteris quilina*)"; 2. verb, meaning "to extend the finger," or, "to seize, to lay hold of." In Tahitian it may also mean "to eat certain sacred or forbidden things." While the latter interpretation could have an alluring application in connection with Loti's heroine, the fact remains that the word is extremely rare and Loti's ear may never have caught it. James Norman Hall and Walter G. Smith, both of Tahiti, to whom this writer referred the question, have never heard the word. Mr. Hall has spent twenty-five years in the islands and Mr. Smith is a New Zealander.

We conclude, therefore, that the name of Loti's Tahitian heroine is an alteration of the name of the volcano Rano-Raraku on Easter Island.³

C. WESLEY BIRD

Fresno State College

¹ *Op. cit.*, 31 août 1872.

² *Maori-Polynesian Comparative Dictionary*, 1891.

³ *Les Annales politiques et littéraires*, 31 mai 1891, reprinted some of Viaud's early sketches and fell into a reverse error by spelling the volcano "Rano-Rarahu."

CUREL ET ROSTAND

Il y a quelques années je signalais certains rapprochements, je n'ose les appeler autrement, entre deux auteurs qui semblaient n'avoir rien en commun : Porto-Riche et Rostand ¹ Aujourd'hui je voudrais rapprocher de Rostand un auteur encore plus inattendu : François de Curel. Un passage de *La Danse devant le Miroir* évoque incontestablement une tirade des *Romanesques*, et par conséquent il paraîtrait que cette fois-ci c'est Curel qui a suivi Rostand puisque *La Danse* date de 1914, et les *Romanesques* de 1894. Je suis obligé de citer ce passage assez long de Rostand :

Sylvette

Le Mur fut un Guignol,—vous l'avez dit vous-même!

Percinet

Sylvette, je l'ai dit!—mais ce fut un blasphème!
Ou du moins . . . quel Guignol, vieux mur, tu nous offrais!
Qui pour portants avait les grands branchages frais,
Pour fond le parc fuyant, l'azur vaste pour frises,
Pour orchestre invisible et vif les quatre brises,
Pour accessoires clairs le rayon et la fleur,
Le soleil pour quinquet, Shakspeare pour souffleur!
Oui, comme à ces pantins dont on gante les vestes,
Nos pères nous faisaient exécuter des gestes:
Mais, dans ce Guignol-là, Sylvette, songez-y,
C'est l'Amour qui faisait parler les pupazzi!

III, 4.

Et voici maintenant ce que Louise et Paul diront dans *La Danse*:

Louise

Enfants trompeurs et sincères, tous deux vous déclamez des rôles . . .
Oui, décidément, deux comédiens, mais avec un mystérieux associé . . .
Votre amour, un vaudeville avec l'idéal pour souffleur! . . .

Paul

Et c'est lui, ce maître divin, qui invente ce que nous ne faisons que réciter.

II, 1.

L'idée est identique, certains mots même sont répétés: serait-il possible que Curel emprunte des idées à Rostand? L'historique même du théâtre de Curel nous rassure: *La Danse devant le Miroir* en effet n'est que la refonte de *L'Amour Brode*, "pièce jouée trois fois, vingt ans auparavant, devant des banquettes vides, et qui devait

¹ MLN., Novembre 1935.

être parfaitement oubliée."² Rostand, lui, ne paraît pas l'avoir oubliée, car tout le passage des *Romanesques* cité plus haut semble un développement de ces quelques lignes qui précèdent immédiatement le dénouement tragique de *L'Amour brode*:

Notre amour! Ah! ouiche! . . . Du rouge, du bleu, des *costumes*, des *tréteaux*, des mots fabriqués plus grands que nature. . . Un vaudeville avec l'idéal pour *souffleur*! . . . III, 10.

On trouve ici, en-dehors même de l'idée principale, couleurs, costumes, tréteaux, souffleur, qui vont reparaître dans Rostand, plus richement orchestrés évidemment. Il est à remarquer que la plupart de ces mots colorés et pittoresques disparaissent dans le passage correspondant de *La Danse*, où l'idée est plus sèchement indiquée, comme on l'a vu. Elle est aussi beaucoup plus claire, et les mots de Paul qui l'éclaircissent: "Et c'est lui, ce maître divin, qui invente ce que nous ne faisons que réciter," semblent comme un écho du dernier vers cité de Rostand: "C'est l'Amour qui faisait parler les pupazzi!" Il serait amusant de supposer que quelques mots de *L'Amour brode* ayant inspiré le passage des *Romanesques*, dont la représentation eut lieu sept mois plus tard, Curel à son tour, en écrivant *La Danse* et conservant cette idée qui paraît lui être chère puisqu'elle reparaît dans cette pièce qui d'après lui est "complètement inédite à part 30 ou 40 lignes,"³ l'ait modifiée sous l'influence des vers de Rostand.

On ne peut d'ailleurs s'empêcher de remarquer que le titre même de cette première pièce de Curel semble avoir fait une certaine impression sur Rostand si nous en jugeons par les deux passages suivants des *Romanesques*:

	S'ils brodent sur leur thème	
Coutumier, cela vaut d'être écouté! . . .		I, 1.
Car elle peut broder, lorsqu'elle aime, notre âme,		
De véritables fleurs sur une fausse trame. ⁴		III, 4.

et par le passage plus fameux de *Cyrano de Bergerac*:

² François de Curel: *Théâtre Complet*, I, 72.

³ François de Curel: *Théâtre Complet*, I, 73.

⁴ Ces deux derniers vers d'ailleurs se rapprochent assez du passage suivant de *L'Amour brode*: "L'amour brode! . . . Pour le quart d'heure, tu tiens les couleurs éclatantes, mais prends garde! . . . Déchireras-tu par dépit la trame qui, dans les bons moments, se laisse si artistement enjoliver? . . . (I, 8)

Roxane
 Asseyons-nous. Parlez. J'écoute.
 Christian
 Je vous aime.
 Roxane
 Oui, parlez-moi d'amour.
 Christian
 Je t'aime,
 Roxane
 C'est le thème
Brodez, brodez.
 Christian
 Je vous . . .
 Roxane
Brodez!
 Christian
 Je t'aime tant.
 Roxane
 Sans doute. Et puis?

IV, 5.

Idée identique, répétition de mots, légère obsession d'une image, il semble bien que tout cela n'est pas uniquement rencontre fortuite, hasard, coïncidence: Rostand paraît bien, lui au moins, avoir reproduit ici, inconsciemment peut-être, un souvenir de lecture ou de représentation.

RENÉ TALAMON

University of Michigan

OLD FRENCH *SEÏLLE* 'BUCKET'

Old French *seille* 'bucket' (<L *sitŭla*) and *seel* 'bucket' (<L *sitella*, *sitellus*; Mod. Fr. *seau*) are common enough in the texts but the dictionaries do not record *seille*. It is found in verse 212 of the *Dit des outils de l'hotel*¹ (13th c.):

Or faut faucillon et faucille,
 212 Corde a puis et une *seille*.

¹ *Romania* XXVIII (1899), 49-60. Of the two manuscripts which preserve the poem, only that of the Musée Condé at Chantilly (No. 1578) contains the passage in which *seille* is found.

In his glossary to the poem, the editor, Gaston Raynaud, translates *seille* as 'seau' without commentary. The rhyme *seille*: *faucille* and the measure of the octosyllabic verse indicate that *seille* is a word of three syllables. *Seilles* (two syllables) is found in verse 156 of the *Dit* in rhyme with *corbeilles*.

The etymology of *seille* is evidently VL **sitacula* with Latin diminutive ending *-icula* (cf. L *sitella*), also present in *faucille* (VL **falcicula*) which rhymes with *seille*. *Seille* is applied specifically in the text to a well-bucket. It is apparently a *hapax* although it is possible that we may have cases of it among the examples of *seille* listed by Godefroy from medieval prose texts. There seems to be no other trace of VL **sitacula* in the Romance territory.

CHARLES H. LIVINGSTON

Bowdoin College

REVIEWS

Die Älteste Chronik der Hutterischen Brüder. Ein Sprachdenkmal aus frühneuhochdeutscher Zeit. Herausgegeben von A. J. F. ZIEGLSCHMID. Philadelphia, Carl Schurz Memorial Foundation, 1943. XXXIX, lxix, 1037 pp.

Eine Quelle wie die *Hutterische Chronik* ist unter vielen Gesichtspunkten—sekten-, sittengeschichtlichen, soziologischen, kulturhistorischen—beachtlich, ihre Veröffentlichung sollte Studien in mancher Richtung anregen und den Weg ebnen. Da aber der Herausgeber schon im Titel den Schwerpunkt auf das Sprachdenkmal legt, das er den Germanisten in diplomatischem Abdruck zur Verfügung stellt, ist es an ihnen, dem Herausgeber zu danken, seine fleissige Sorgfalt zu bewundern und zu bestätigen, daß hier in der Tat eine linguistische Fundgrube erschlossen ist. In jedem Fall ist der Abdruck eines Textes zu begrüßen, dessen Sprache der undeutlichen Epoche angehört, in der sich über den Mundarten die Schrift dialekte etabliert haben und die Einigung der neuhochdeutschen Schriftsprache vorbereiten. Das sprachgeschichtlich Reizvolle der *Chronik* liegt nun darin, daß sich in ihr die Sprache einer fanatischen Sekte erhalten hat, d. h. eines religiösen Standes, der die Zu- und Ausgänge zur sprachlichen Umwelt abschließt, schon bevor politische Verfolgung die sprachliche Isolierung erpresst. Der Mutterboden, auf dem diese Sprache sprießt, ist

einerseits die *Deutsche Bibel* nicht Luthers, sondern Zürichs, die sogenannte *Froschauer-Bibel* anderseits das Tiroler Bairisch des Sektenführers Jakob Huter, dessen Nachfolger Amon, Lantzenstil, Wallbot, Krail auch alle aus Tirol und Bayern stammen. Da aber der wichtigste Chronist K. Braitmichel († 1573) ein Schlesier ist, haben wir in den ältesten Teilen der *Chronik* ein bairisch gefärbtes Alemannisch im Munde eines Ostmitteldeutschen. Aus Gründen, die fürs 16. Jahrhundert die triftigsten sind, aus Gründen des Glaubens, wählt ein Chronist nicht seine, sondern seiner Gemeinde Sprache. Der Wert der Sprachquelle ist leider dadurch vermindert, daß der Schreiber der ersten 562 Seiten ein Rheinhesse ist (er schreibt S. 40 u. 64 schles. *Costnitz* < tschech. *costnice*, *Beinhaus* für *Konstanz*; behält die bair. Dualform *ös* als *es* bei, das er freilich mißversteht, und ebenso schles. *beede* für *beide*; liefert Huters Brief von 1535 zwar *nach laut der ersten Coppey*, aber ohne besondere Dialektmerkmale), daß sechs andere Hände an der *Chronik* arbeiten, daß das intellektuelle Niveau der Schreiber, endlich der ganzen Gemeinde kaum über das Kleinbauerntum hinausragt. So weiß man nie, ob aus dem allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch verschwundene Formen Früchte der selbstverhängten Isolierung sind oder 'gesunkenes Kulturgut.' Jedenfalls hat der Sprachhistoriker zu tun mit bairisch gefärbtem Westoberdeutsch eines Schlesiens, niedergeschrieben von einem Rheinhesen.

Es wäre unbillig, dem Herausgeber vorzuhalten, daß er zum Text nicht gleich noch das Handwerkszeug liefert, so komplizierten sprachgeschichtlichen Tatbeständen zu Leibe zu gehen. Doch darf man beklagen, daß er einmal mehr, ein andermal weniger als nötig getan hat. Mehr als nötig, denn bei solchen Editionen soll man nicht weitergehen als die *Deutschen Texte des Mittelalters*. Kalligraphische Launen, die uns verschiedene Formen des *s* und *r* beschert haben, wird kein kundiger Editor berücksichtigen, noch wird er den Text mit allerhand Ligaturen beschweren. Der Druck hätte wohlfeiler und zugleich lesbarer sein können, hätte Z. den Begriff des 'Diplomatischen' nicht überspannt. Für den, der das Bild einer wirklichen Handschrift braucht, reichen die zwanzig Tafeln am Ende des Buches aus. Die Textwiedergabe selbst ist peinlich gewissenhaft und allem Anschein nach ziemlich frei von schwereren Versen, ist aber gefolgt von einem ganz unzulänglichen *Glossar*. Dem Fachmann ist nicht damit gedient, wenn für ein Wort eine Bedeutung gegeben ist, die es unter anderen auch einmal haben mag; es sei denn gesagt, *wo*; und der Laie wird in peinlich häufigen Fällen gradezu falsch belehrt.

Die Schwäche des *Glossars* ist vor allem darum zu beklagen, weil unsere Kenntnis des frühneuhochdeutschen Wortschatzes ohnehin mangelhaft ist. Götzes *Frühnhd. Glossar* gibt immer nur die allgemeinsten Bedeutungen ohne Belege; in den ersten vierzig Jahren des *DWB.* ist die Literatur des 15. Jahrhunderts nicht

genügend herangezogen; Geiler ist seit 1525 nicht wieder gedruckt, sein Wortgut nur von Charles Schmidt wenigstens teilweise verarbeitet; Murners *Deutsche Schriften* sind noch im Erscheinen begriffen; das *Luther-Wörterbuch* ist seinerzeit beim Buchstaben H steckengeblieben; die Vollendung von Trübners *Deutschem Wörterbuch* hat der Krieg gestört, wie schon vorher politische Beflissenheit manchem Lemma zum Verhängnis geworden; dem Wortschatz von Sekten wie den Schwenkfeldern, den Wiedertäufern um Müntzer oder Thomas von Imbroich hat niemand Aufmerksamkeit geschenkt. Woraus sich Z.s Unbeholfenheit teilweise erklärt.

Referenten, wie vor allem Walz in *JEPG* 43 (1944), 461-74 und Roedder in *MfDU*. xxxvii (1945), 124-26, haben eine grössere Anzahl grober Schnitzer berichtet. Es ist leicht, da fortzufahren. Nur geht es nicht an, für das Wortgut der *Chronik* das *Schwäbische Wörterbuch* heranzuziehen, um daraus Wortbedeutungen zu belegen. Walz aao. 467 gibt für *aushandeln* die rechte Bedeutung. Aber warum aus dem Schwäbischen? Die zeigt nicht nur Schmeller aus einem bairischen Wörterbuch von 1618, sondern auch das *Schweizer. Idiotikon*. Daß *aufwitschen* im *Schwäbischen Wörterbuch* *rasch emporfahren* ist (Walz 468), ist eine weniger treffende Beobachtung als die, daß die alemannischen Lexikographen Maaler und Dasy-podius das Wort so verstehen. Das muß vermerkt werden. Denn im Schweizerisch-Tirolischen wurzelt die Sekte und hält am Wortgut der beiden alpinen Mundarten mit der Verbissenheit von Sektierern fest. Das Wort des Herrn, dem die Frommen folgen, war ihnen gegeben und erklungen in schweizerischer Form. Davon haben wir auszugehen.

Die Beziehungen der *Chronik* zur *Züricher Bibel* liegen besonders klar zutage in den zahllosen Bibelzitaten. In einer entlegenen Notiz im *Glossar* S. 1006 f. (zum Verb *richten*) führt Z. diese Tatsache auch mal an, aber sie hätte ihn bei der Worterklärung *leiten* sollen. Statt im *Glossar* 990 den 'alem. erweiterten Plural *höhinen*,' die *Höhen* zu notieren, bemerkt man besser, daß die ganze Stelle 21. 36 wortwörtlich der *Züricher Bibel* entnommen ist. Luc. 22. 52 lautet bei Luther *mitt schwerdten vnnd mit stangen*; die *Züricher Bibel* schreibt *kolben* statt *stangen*, und ebenso die *Chronik*. Oder *Chronik* 126. 5 steht *reissende vnd schwäre wölff*, wozu das *Glossar* 1011 '*widerwertig*' (Duden!) bemerkt. Aber *Apostelgesch.* 20. 29 heißt es eben in der *Züricher Bibel* *schwäre wölff*, worin sie nämlich Luther folgt, der erst 1530 das veraltende Wort durch *gewulche* ersetzt. *Chronik* 11. 20 liest man, daß Moses das *Zeuglied* gestellt, was erst verständlich wird durch *Z. B. Deuter.* 31. 19. Daß Luthers *gehorschen* in der *Chronik* wie in der *Z. B. gehorsam sein* lautet, ist zu erwarten. Im Haupttitel der *Chronik* (S. iii) findet sich das Partiz. *gewannet*, wozu das *Glossar* 1026 bemerkt: *wannen* (mhd. schw. *wannen* 'mit der Futterschwinge schwingen') *sieben*,

sondern. Demnach gehört zu den mhd. Autoren Fischart, Stieler, sogar Adelung! In jedem schweizer. oder elsäß. oder schwäb. Wörterbuch, dazu bei Schmeller oder Götze, kann man obd. Belege in Menge finden; aber wie die eine Bedeutung der andern zu Grunde liegt, zeigt eben wieder nur die Z. B. Denn *Amos* 9. 9 übersetzen die deutschen Druckbibeln *wirt zusammengeschlagen der weize mitt eim siebe*, wofür Luther setzt *mit eim sieb sichtet*. Z. B. aber schreibt *als so man reysteret oder wannet*.—In *ein gericht volckh beraiten* 26. 21 soll laut *Glossar* 983 *gericht bereit* bedeuten. Die Stelle ist aus *Luc.* 1. 17. Die ersten deutschen Druckbibeln schreiben *durnechtigs volk*, von Zainer ab *volkummens volk*. Luther spricht von *gerust volck*, das Z. B. als gerüst übernimmt. So schlage ich vor, in der *Chronik* zu lesen, denn *geriht* bedeutet *grade*, *gradenwegs* (Jelinek 290), *bereit* dagegen heißt *gerehte* (Benecke-Müller-Zarncke 2, 1, 617). *Chronik* 46. 6 lese ich *Da hat Zwingel nit gewölt vnd fürgeben Es würde ein auffruer außgeben*. Nach Ausweis des *Glossars* 963 wäre die Bedeutung des Verbs *sich rühmen, ergibig* (Duden!) *sein*. Aber natürlich muß es statt *außgeben*—Einfluß von *fürgeben*—*ausgên* heißen, was heute noch in der Bedeutung *ausbrechen* gebraucht wird. Wenn man nur wüsste, wessen Hand hier geirrt hat, die des Schreibers oder die des Herausgebers. Welch letzterem aber das Folgende zur Last fällt:

außmustern 39. 9 fehlt im *Glossar*. Götzes Bedeutung '*als ungeeignet ausscheiden*' stimmt hier nicht, sondern die im *Idiot.* 4, 545 f. aus dem Jahr 1586 belegte: *mit Gewalt hinausweisen*. Vgl. Schmeller 1, 1685.

entgentzen, *Glossar* 975 ist nicht nhd. *zerstücken* sondern *zerstückeln*. Vgl. auch Schmeller 1, 927.

Fleckh 131. 22 statt *blätz* der Z. B. wäre im *Glossar* zu notieren.

fluchss, flux, niemals vor S. 108 gebraucht, fehlt im *Glossar*.

Fuer 71. 26. *Glossar* 980 verzeichnet *füer* als Konj. zu *fahren*, aber nicht *fuer*, die *Fuhre*.

Habith 37. 30 fehlt im *Glossar*. Bedeutung: *das Gewand*. Vgl. Stieler.

häferlen 102. 17 ist nicht einfach 'im Obd. *kleiner Topf*' (*Glossar* 987), sondern bair.-österr. Vgl. Kretschmer 531 ff.

Hey nit 159. 25 fehlt im *Glossar*. Für die Bedeutung *reg dich nicht auf* vgl. Schmeller 1, 1026 f.; *Idiot.* 2, 1103; *Els. Wtb.* 1, 312; *DWb.* 4, 1, 2, 2340.

Hertzenkundiger 47. 10. *Glossar* 989 stellt den Sachverhalt nicht richtig dar, wenn es die Wendung *herzenkundiger Gott* Luther zuschreibt 'die Schweizerbibeln dafür *Herzenkenner*.'—Die *Froschauer Bibeln* bis 1538 folgen nämlich Luther, der seinerseits schon ab 1530 *Gott der hertz kündiger* wählt; erst zehn Jahre später druckt Froschauer *Gott, der erkenner der hertzen*. Die Feststellung ist darum wichtig, weil die *Chronik* hier scheinbar Luthern folgt, was in Wirklichkeit nicht der Fall ist.

Larvenwerck 34. 38 fehlt im *Glossar*. Die Bedeutung *Maulchristentum* kann man nicht raten. Vgl. dafür *Schweizer. Idiot.*

Nattergall 102. 23 entspricht *Hiob* 20. 19, wo Luther natürlich von *Ottern-galle* spricht. Erst Z. B. 1560 bringt statt *Nattergalle* *Schlangengift*. Das *Glossar* schweigt.

raach vnd wee 128. 15 soll laut *Glossar* 1005 *Rache und Wehe* sein. Aber

- in derselben Bedeutung heißt es 135. 12 *wee vnd angst*, 150. 31 u. 153. 11 *Ach vnd wee und abermals wee*, Wahrscheinlich ist *raach* nur ein 'alttestamentarisch' verstärktes *ach*.
- Saagen* 31. 39 hält *Glossar* 1008 für einen Dat. Plur. statt Sing. von *Säge*. *Saurtaig* 145. 19 ist in einem obd. Text nicht so selbstverständlich, daß das *Glossar* es übergehen sollte.
- Scharwachter* 71. 37. *Patrouille, Ronde* noch bei Stieler 2394.
- Schlundt* 129. 11, ein bair. Synonym für *Rachen* (Ecks *Dt. Bibel*), fehlt.
- sein. Glossar* 1011 f. steht der Konjugation des Verbs hilflos gegenüber.
- Petrus* . . . *bezeugt öffentlichen dises ein werck Gottes sein* (28. 32) liegt lateinische Konstruktion mit *accus. c. infin. vor*.
- steiff. Glossar* 1014 mag *fest, wacker* bedeuten, aber 80. 6 heißt es *beständig*. Dem obd. ursprünglich fremd, ist es um 1500 schweizer. Modewort.
- Teicht* wird *Glossar* 1016 bairisch genannt 'Nebenform mit angefügtem -t'. Der Züricher Lexikograph Maaler hat das Wort auch, und die *Z. B.* sagt *teiche*.
- thets nit war* 83. 11 ist nicht 'tat nicht dergleichen' (*Glossar* 1017); *war tuon* heißt nämlich *bemerken*. vgl. *Lexen* 3,687; *Schmeller* 2,968.
- Vndergebung* 27. 33 fehlt im *Glossar*. Es bedeutet aber nicht, wie die zugrunde liegende Bibelstelle *Vergebung* sondern *Unterwerfung*, wie noch Stieler 657 zeigt.
- verbringen. Glossar* 1021 bringt die Bedeutung *vollbringen* nicht.
- verreiben. Glossar* 1023 mißverstet die Bedeutung, die nicht *verwunden, verletzen* ist, sondern *umdrehen*. Vgl. *Schmeller* 2, 8.
- wuest. Laut Glossar* 1029 ist die frühhd. Bedeutung *Eiter, Kot. Allen wuest vnd greuel der zerstörung* heißt natürlich *alle Vervüstung* . . . *Stalder* 2,461 belegt einmal *der wuest = Unkraut*, aber noch bei Stieler ist *wüst* die Entsprechung für *confusum chaos*.
- zerschleppft* soll laut *Glossar* 1030 bedeuten *zu Tode geschleift*. Das Verb hat nichts zu tun mit *schleifen*, sondern ist *schlaipfen = extinguere*. Bei *Schmeller* 2,551 ist eine Quelle von 1605 zitiert: *dörffer abgeprandt vnd zerschlaipft*. Stieler 1807 übersetzt es mit *pessundare, unter die Füße treten, niederstampfen*.
- Was zeichst dich* hat mit *zeigen* (*Glossar* 1030) überhaupt nichts zu tun, aber auch *Walz* Deutung trifft nicht den Sinn der Stelle 68. 35. *Was belatest du dich selbst* ist die Übersetzung. Vgl. *Lexen* 3,1111.

Das sind einige meiner Ausstellungen, beschränkt auf ein Zehntel des ganzen Textes und unter Verzicht auf das schon von andern Rezensenten Geäußerte. Die Auswertung des Textes muß warten, bis ein *Glossar* geschaffen ist, das bescheidenen Ansprüchen genügt. Am leichtesten wäre eine Detail-Untersuchung der Seiten 270-315, wo das *Gesetzbuch* der Gemeinde aus lauter wörtlichen Bibel-Auszügen niedergelegt wird. Wo hier der Text der *Züricher Bibel* verlassen ist, werden bedeutende Gründe dafür verantwortlich sein, Elemente einer 'Hutterischen Sprache' werden sich auffinden lassen. Seite 24 gibt der Chronist an, er habe die folgenden Seiten aus *Flavius Josephus* gezogen. Eine genaue Vergleichung hat mir keinerlei Anzeichen dafür ergeben, daß *Caspar Hedios* berühmte Übersetzung benutzt wurde.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

The Johns Hopkins University.

Festschrift für M. Blakemore Evans. Columbus: The Ohio State University Press, 1945. 208 pp.

Upon the occasion of his retirement from the chairmanship of the Department of German of the Ohio State University an impressive number of friends and pupils of M. Blakemore Evans wished to express their gratitude and admiration for their distinguished colleague and guide. Their fine testimonial volume appeared not only within the frame of the *Monatshefte für Deutschen Unterricht* (Vol. xxxvii, Nos. 4-5) but also as a separate number of the Language Series of the Graduate School of Ohio State University. Even those who might be averse to the omnium gatherums called *Festschriften* will admit that both the range and the level of the contributions justify this enterprise. The articles honor the donors as well as the recipient who probably had a share in their being brought forth in many instances. Thus, the motto of the *Festschrift* should be the slightly changed *Matthew* 7.20: 'By their fruits ye shall know him.'

The reviewer, greatly impressed by the scholarship displayed in so many ways, does not feel qualified to give a reasoned opinion on the volume as a whole. Most of the two dozen contributions before him are beyond his competence; they simply add to his store of knowledge. Therefore, instead of summing up the contents he limits himself to mentioning a few articles by which his particular interest was roused. Bloomfield's model description of French inflection is excellent in methods, disregards, however, the fluctuation which takes place in every spoken language even in a strictly regulated one.—Ogle discovers some unquestionable influence of Luther on Coverdale's Bible-translation.—Philippon gives a critical report on basic methods of *Märchenforschung* as manipulated in Nazi-Germany.¹—A number of articles deal with the theater of the late Middle Ages the knowledge of which was greatly increased by the writings of Evans himself. Specialists such as Kramer, Rapp, Nordsieck, and Jordan search into the history of the stage. I am sorry to say that Jordan's article fails to satisfy me; his attempt to derive 'auftreten' of the NHG stage terminology from the MHG tournament term 'ûf den plân trêten' is not conclusive. It might be pertinent to ask where the MHG phrase is used in the representative courtly epic. The vocabularies are rather silent, and as far as I know there is no proof before 1350. Since the phrase must have been taken from the French it may be significant that—apart from one Provençal source *Flamenca*², 8090—the *Chanson d'Antioche*, Vol. II, v. 196 shows the sole use of it in courtois

¹ Ph. errs in stating on p. 149 that Conrad von Würzburg is possibly the author of *Dieu halbe bir*. Compare Landau, *Zsfda*. 50 (1908), 158-166; *Beiträge*, 47 (1923), 8; Ehrismann, *Geschichte d. dt. Literatur*, Vol. II, 2, 2 (1935), 54; Leitzmann, *Beiträge*, 63 (1939), 412.

French. To be sure, Jordan may still be right, the question, however, cannot be answered by dealing with German developments alone.—Kurath's article on *German relics in Pennsylvania English* pursues the mixing of some German words in the English of the same area at the border of which they seem to be completely stopped. Thus, the limitations of foreign words and their possibilities within colonial English are excellently illustrated.—Then, there are stimulating articles by tried masters of learning such as Hohlfeld, Fairley, Price, Feise, Archer Taylor, and Bruns. How two Miltonic words are taken over in the German poetic vocabulary of the eighteenth century is shown by Walz. They had, however, ornamental value only, and went down with the century as victims of the Great Revolution. Of greater bearing is the history of the word group 'innig(lich)' as given by Fleischhauer. Here, Genesis and rise of a word is connected with that of twelfth-century Mysticism (Bernard of Clairvaux) illuminating the history of ideas by lexical facts.—The godfather of Fleischhauer's meticulous analysis is likely Sperber who himself is represented by a prudent rejection of *Behaviorism in Linguistics*. His plain reasoning, his lucid arguments anointed by a gentle humor clarify the issue which is somewhat beclouded by the making a stir of the opposing groups of 'Mechanists' and 'Mentalists.'—The concluding pages of the *Festschrift* are devoted to M. B. Evans; a sketch of his life is followed by an imposing array of his publications crowned by his critical edition of *The Lucerne Passion Play*.

ARNO SCHIROKAUER

The Johns Hopkins University

Goedekes Grundriß zur Geschichte der deutschen Dichtung. Neue Folge, Fortführung von 1830 bis 1880. Im Auftrage der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften herausgegeben von GEORG MINDE-POUET. Lieferung 1 (Band 1, Bogen 1-13). Dresden: L. Ehlermann, 1940. vi, 208 pp.

The Prussian Academy of Sciences was fortunate in securing the distinguished scholar Professor Georg Minde-Pouet to serve as editor-in-chief for the continuation of Goedekes *Grundriß* for the years 1830 to 1880. His experience as a bibliographer, critic, and librarian, and his wide contacts with scholars and libraries have stood him in good stead in planning the long delayed continuation of the *Grundriß*.

Under Professor Minde-Pouet's direction there appeared in September, 1934, a guide to collaborators of the *Grundriß*, entitled

Grundsätze der Bearbeitung (Dresden, Ehlermann, 87 pp.). This careful plan, drawn up in the interest of consistency and uniformity, has borne fruit in the first fascicle whose appearance in this country was delayed by the Second World War long after its publication.

Since an undertaking of such scope required a subvention, the German government was prevailed upon to provide funds. But great difficulties arose when the National-Socialistic régime objected to the inclusion of the numerous Jewish authors, scholars and critics. Finally, after bitter opposition and protracted argument, a compromise was reached; this stipulated that such writers might be included, but that they be designated as Jews, (Jd), wherever their origin could be established. The government threatened to withdraw financial support if this provision were not carried out.

In a foreword the plan of this continuation and the reasons for changes from the old organization of material are set forth. Authors who are still living and those who had already appeared in earlier volumes of the *Grundriß* are excluded. German literature written in other countries is to be given due consideration. The old division into historical periods and the former classification into literary forms, subject matter, and themes are replaced by a more practical alphabetical arrangement based on the names of authors. This seemed to be the simplest means of avoiding confusion, repetition, and scattered presentation. A greater measure of perspective is subsequently to be achieved by giving a general view of the history of the literature of this period, regional grouping of authors, and a synchronized table of principal dates and events.

The bibliography of writings on German literature from 1830 to 1880 which precedes the alphabetical listing of individual authors contains almost 1800 titles under the following headings: Bibliographische Hilfsmittel; Der Zeitraum 1830 bis 1880 in Darstellungen der deutschen Dichtung; Allgemeine Literatur über den Zeitraum 1830 bis 1880; Besondere Literatur; Gattungen der Dichtkunst; Dichtung einzelner Länder und Landschaften; Auslandsdeutsche Volksgruppen. Most of these have a variety of sub-headings; material under each one is arranged chronologically.

The broad scope of this bibliography can probably be indicated best by listing the captions under one author. Hermann Allmers may serve as an example. A biographical and critical sketch is followed by these headings: Handschriften; Bibliographie und Sammelwerke; Biographie und allgemeine Charakteristik; Einzelne Lebensabschnitte; Einzelausgaben der Werke; Beiträge in Sammelwerken und Werken anderer; Beiträge in Zeitschriften, Zeitungen, Kalendern; Gesamtausgabe; A. als bildender Künstler; A. als Tonsetzer; Briefe; Gespräche, Tagebücher, Lebenserinnerungen;

Übersetzungen; Schriften über Sprache, Lebensauffassung, Kunst, Politik, Beziehungen zu Zeitgenossen; Schriften über die Werke; A. im Bilde; Die Werke in der bildenden Kunst; Die Werke in der Vertonung; Dichtungen auf A.; Gedenkstätten; Vereine und Gesellschaften. These entries under Hermann Allmers cover almost twenty-seven pages.

Great care has been exercised in preparing new obvious abbreviations of journals so that consultation of the table is almost unnecessary. A final volume is to list anonymous and pseudonymous writings whose authors could not be ascertained. The Roman type is excellent.

Even a cursory glance at the organization, classification and arrangement of material will impress scholars with the magnitude, thoroughness, and meticulous care which mark this undertaking as a notable achievement in bibliography.

The first fascicle extends through Ludwig von Alvensleben. It is to be hoped that, despite present untoward conditions, this formidable work may soon be continued and completed. Even a novice can use it with ease.

JOHN C. BLANKENAGEL

Wesleyan University

The Life of Edmund Spenser. By ALEXANDER C. JUDSON. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Pp. xii + 238. \$4.50.

The last full-length biography of Spenser, as Professor Judson reminds us, was Grosart's (1884), and even the short biographical sketches of the last few decades have become more or less out of date as the body of Spenseriana has grown. The writing of a new biography involves more than working some new facts into an old pattern. The total of positive personal data is still, of course, very scanty and imposes on the biographer the task of re-creating a person and a life largely out of successive backgrounds; then almost every known fact is attended by a cluster of queries and conjectures; and, finally, modern scholarship has added much to the criticism of Spenser's poetry and to our knowledge of the Elizabethan world in general and of many individual figures great and small. Professor Judson, as one would expect, brings to his work ample and varied learning and a sober, trustworthy judgment.

Starting with the substantial records of the Spencers of Althorp (who, by the way, can hardly be called a "noble" family), and the importance of the connection to their humble kinsman, we see Spenser as a happy boy in London, absorbing Mulcaster's teaching at Merchant Taylors' School; contributing translations, as a school-boy, to Van der Noot's *Theatre*, which, both as an emblem book (the first in England) and as an anti-Catholic work in the apo-

calyptic vein, may have left its mark upon the young poet; and as a student at Cambridge during years of Puritan-Anglican controversy and in friendly association with Harvey. If the boy and young man inevitably remain something of a phantom, Professor Judson, with a store of suggestive details from the poems and miscellaneous sources, at least gives us a full view of the worlds he lived in and of his probable reactions.

Mists begin to thicken with chapter vi, "In the North Parts." From Spenser's leaving Cambridge, which may have been as early as 1574, until he became secretary to Bishop Young in 1578, we know almost nothing, apart from the general evidence of poetical activity and the poet's own apparent testimony to his having witnessed the execution of Morrogh O'Brien at Limerick in July, 1577. By the summer of 1579 he was in London. His introduction to Leicester may have come through Sidney or Harvey. One is glad that Professor Judson, in his analysis of the Spenser-Harvey letters, dismisses "the Areopagus" as "a humorous bit of figurative language." The letters of course show very clearly that the word was ironical, as modern Spenserians have generally recognized, but the myth of a literary club, which Dr. Maynadier demolished in 1909, has died hard.

Professor Judson sensibly holds to the view that E. K. was an actual friend and not merely Spenser's Mrs. Harris. He also accepts the actuality of Rosalind, though not the idea that she became Spenser's first wife. He accepts Mr. Hamer's argument that Spenser married before he went to Ireland, but "we cannot be certain" that the bride was the "Machabyas Chylde" whose marriage to "Edmounde Spenser" (October 27, 1579) Professor Eccles discovered, since there were several Edmund Spensers in England at this time.

Spenserian scholars at present are doubtless divided in regard to Greenlaw's theory that the final episode of *Mother Hubberds Tale* was written in 1579-80 as a warning against the Alençon marriage, a theory which has long stood almost as established fact. Professor Judson favors the theory, though he is sceptical about relating *Virgils Gnat* to the affair. This may be the right view, since, granted some large assumptions, it is quite plausible. But to me at least Dr. Harold Stein's objections (though not his identification of the Ape with James VI) seem pretty cogent; and one may incline, so far, to the opinion of Professor Brice Harris—whom, with Dr. Stein, Professor Judson mentions in a footnote—that the Fox and the Ape are Burghley and his son Robert Cecil. At any rate, "Spenser's going to Ireland in 1580 as Arthur Lord Grey's secretary seems natural, quite aside from any disruption of the good relations between Spenser and Leicester." The Irish appointment, Professor Judson thinks, was probably brought about by the Sidneys.

A large part of the book is devoted to the eighteen years of

Spenser's official life in Ireland. The author's *Spenser in Southern Ireland* especially qualifies him for a detailed account of the Irish scene. But, along with the story of war and rebellion, and of Spenser's public activities and private troubles, Professor Judson draws upon the poetry and the *View* to emphasize his real attachment to Ireland and his enjoyment of quiet country life. Professor Judson makes full use also of contemporary descriptions and documents, and of the Spenserian researches of Professor Jenkins and others. Incorporated in the chronicle are accounts of Lord Grey, Lodowick Bryskett (whose deputy in the clerkship of Munster Spenser became, probably in 1584), and Sir John and Sir Thomas Norris. Against Mrs. Bennett's argument that Artegall in France is Sir John Norris, by the way, Professor Judson holds to the more glamorous Essex, for whom Spenser had special admiration.

Interludes, mainly pleasant, in the Irish narrative are provided by Spenser's visits to London and his publications, and by his second marriage, presumably on June 11, 1594, to Elizabeth Boyle, a distant relative of the Spencers of Althorp. Spenser's last journey to London does not of course make a pleasant interlude, though Professor Judson endorses the modern opinion that he could not have died of actual want.

The book ends with a discussion of the portraits of Spenser and a very brief but judicious estimate of the man and the poet. Throughout the author uses the poems for biographical and historical matter, and he has also concise general accounts which keep one reminded of the poet's themes and manner. Some readers could have spared many details about Irish affairs for the sake of a fuller critique of the poetry, a critique which would go further toward placing Spenser in a larger perspective as not merely an Elizabethan but a Renaissance poet, which would make clearer his serious claims upon the modern reader. Professor Judson was, no doubt, writing mainly for scholars, who are inclined to take such claims for granted, but in the standard biography of the chief of the Great Unread one would have welcomed a higher proportion of general criticism. It would be hard to find any fault with the book as biography. It accomplishes admirably what it sets out to do, and it displays unobtrusively all the scholarly virtues. It is very satisfactory to be no longer driven to this and that article, but to have a full, concrete, and reliable study of the poet in his milieu. I have mentioned some of the many particular problems on which the reader is given a considered verdict. Apart from the possibility of new discoveries, one cannot think that Professor Judson's handling of both known materials and debatable questions will leave much room for criticism or correction.

The book is handsomely produced in the format of the Variorum Edition, to which it makes a valuable supplement. Its value and attractiveness are enhanced by numerous illustrations.

Harvard University

DOUGLAS BUSH

Renaissance Literary Criticism: a Study of its Social Content. By VERNON HALL, JR. New York: Columbia University Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 260. \$3.00.

It was the purpose of this study to examine that portion of Renaissance criticism which was directly affected by social and political ideas; however, since Mr. Hall applies the term *social* very inclusively, and since he is convinced that "in the Renaissance little attempt was made at a dichotomy between social and so-called aesthetic thinking" (p. 1), he brings all of the criticism of the period into his scope.

Indeed, Mr. Hall has sought to prove that most of the features of that criticism result from aristocratic prejudices, that in the Renaissance the theory of poetry grew out of a theory of society.¹ "Literature was looked upon as a means of promoting an ordered society where everything and everybody would have an assigned place" (p. 13). Because they valued order highly and believed that order must rest on law, the critics relied on rules. Their insistence on universality "denoted a desire to build up a cultural order European in scope." Suspicious of "democratic" Greece, the critics turned to the critical tradition of authoritarian Rome, considering Virgil a greater poet than Homer because "Virgil's claims were political, moral, and social as well as poetical" (p. 14). The term *imitation* carried great weight because it connoted the attempt to recreate the moral-political ideal of ancient Rome in Renaissance society. If poetry and criticism were considered serious business, it was because "the task of the poet and critic was no less than the remolding of society." Authoritarianism in criticism sprang from a conviction that authoritarianism alone could ward off chaos in society. The ideal hierarchy of that society was reflected in a hierarchy of poetic genres ranked according to the class of men with which they dealt. It was on this ground alone that critics exalted epic and tragedy above all other forms and forbade *mélange des genres* as a breach of social propriety.

Mr. Hall's treatment of decorum is the heart of his argument. He believes that it was simply a class-concept signifying "observance of the distinctions of rank" (p. 211 f.), and demanding that kings be depicted as kings, rabble as rabble. It was, he thinks, merely the translation into aesthetics of a concern lest the masses and the middle class fail to keep their place. But Mr. Hall has not found any critic of the Renaissance who reasoned from society to poetry in this way, and his reader fears that he has not fully considered the age and complexity of the concept. It was certainly

¹ The relationship between this thesis and that of Veblen is evident and noteworthy. Mr. Hall's sharp departure from Burckhardt's view of the Renaissance state as a work of art is also of interest: to Mr. Hall the work of art is a state.

not a Renaissance invention. The critics of the period could find it in Horace (*Ars Poetica*, lines 153-78) and especially in the very influential discussion by Cicero (*De Officiis*, I, 93-151), which was buttressed by an ancient and highly developed Greek notion of suitability, fitness, or propriety, expressed in the term *πρέπον* in a number of writers from Aristotle (*Rhetoric*, II, 12-17; *Poetics*, 15) to Longinus (IX, 9-11). Decorum was related to the idea of gradation or degree, which was at bottom a metaphysical, rather than a social, concept; in its aesthetic application it demanded that the agents of poetry be true to type and self-consistent.

There are other points at which Mr. Hall draws larger conclusions than the evidence seems to warrant. If, for example, he were right in concluding that the movement against rhyme in sixteenth-century England was just the product of the critics' scorn for rhymed popular verse, would there not be as much democracy in Daniel's *Defence* as there is aristocracy in Campion's *Observations*? Mr. Hall's conclusions about Milton's critical theory, based on the choruses of *Samson Agonistes*, are not convincing. He could easily have found more satisfying evidence of Spenser's aristocracy than his unsubstantiated interpretation of the two Florimells affords. Many readers will think that Mr. Hall is too readily content with social or political reasons for critical beliefs and will wish that he had more often considered whether other factors might not have been equally or more important—as when he emphasizes the political reasons for the critics' loyalty to Rome without taking into account their relative unfamiliarity with the Greek tradition, when he stresses the snobbishness of the hexametrists without mentioning their rather pedantic classicism, or when he suggests that Puritanism was simply a political phenomenon.

Mr. Hall has done a service to the study of Renaissance literary criticism by calling our attention again to the inherent aristocracy which we are likely to take for granted and forget. Most of his readers will readily agree that, insofar as it was touched at all by social forces, the criticism of the Renaissance was aristocratic in tone, but many will be dissatisfied with this attempt to show that these social forces shaped and governed that criticism as completely as Mr. Hall believes. History would be a more comfortable, but a much less interesting, discipline if we could be sure that when we have found one explanation we have found all.

F. MICHAEL KROUSE

Baltimore, Maryland

The Critical Theory of Lord Kames. By HELEN WHITCOMB RANDALL. Northampton, 1944. Pp. xiii + 147. (Smith College Studies In Modern Languages, vol. 22, 1-4).

This book is an excellent study of one of the most significant figures in later eighteenth-century criticism. Professor Randall's analysis of the text of the *Elements* begins with the fact, not enough emphasized by other writers, that Kames' critical theory, unlike his philosophy, is "single and inclusive" and that consequently each part must be understood in terms of his special point of view. Partly as a result of her recognition of the importance of this preliminary statement, her treatment of the text is everywhere competent and in certain places shows particular insights. Her observation that Kames' theory turns attention away from established literary forms, her suggestive citation of passages from Wordsworth, and the detailed analysis of the idea of succession point out significant and previously unnoticed aspects of the theory.

Some question may be raised about her belief that Kames was indebted for his method to Newton's concept of analysis and synthesis. Kames does not mention Newton, and his use of the method described is somewhat disjointed and inconclusive. This doubt, however, relates only to the origin of his method. Professor Randall notes clearly his dependence upon the philosophy of his time for content but perhaps does not sufficiently stress the fact that he might have derived his method as well as his content from philosophy.

The biographical information in the first chapter, which is made more vivid by the inclusion in an appendix of a series of previously unpublished letters, fills a distinct gap in contemporary knowledge of Kames. The early *Memoirs* by Lord Woodhouselee, which was the most readily available source of information about Kames, merely obscured its subject.

The outline of the history of the *Elements* in Chapter IV demonstrates the enduring popularity of the book as a text in criticism, and the list of editions indicates its widespread use in the United States. It is noteworthy that the list, although not necessarily complete, runs to well over thirty items, and that the date of the last edition cited is 1883. The analysis of the text and the presentation of the historical materials give substantial backing to the author's belief in the importance of Kames and point both by reference and by implication to a kind of criticism in the eighteenth century about which there have been many misapprehensions and to which too little attention has been paid.

GORDON MCKENZIE

University of California,
Berkeley

Annals of the New York Stage. Vol. XIV. By GEORGE C. D. ODELL.
New York: Columbia University Press, 1945. xvi, 935 pp.
\$8.75.

In this volume Dr. Odell records the stage productions of what he describes as "The Closing Epoch." During the years 1888 to 1891, there was a climax in the theatre, marked by the passing of Edwin Booth, Lawrence Barrett and Mary Anderson. There is a certain natural nostalgia in Dr. Odell's comparison of these great actors with the sterling players who were to appear in the '90s, but I cannot question his decision. I saw Booth only once, but I can still hear him say "Cordelia! Cordelia! Stay a little!"

In 1888 Augustin Daly's theatre at Broadway and 30th Street, was easily the foremost in the country. The quartette of John Drew, James Lewis, Mrs. Gilbert and Ada Rehan provided the best entertainment to be found in the theatre. Daly was producing his adaptations from the German, altered so greatly by his own dramatic talent that they became almost new creations. The Lyceum Theatre, under the management of Daniel Frohman, was probably Daly's chief rival, and was more hospitable to American plays than A. M. Palmer at the Madison Square. Here *Lord Chumley*, by David Belasco and Henry de Mille, with E. H. Sothern in the title role, was a deserved success.

In view of today's prices, it is interesting to remember that one could buy the best seats for \$1.50. More interesting for the student of American drama was the season of 1889-1890. On May 19, 1890, Clyde Fitch's first important play, *Beau Brummel*, produced by Richard Mansfield at the Madison Square, is rightly described by Dr. Odell as "one of the most charming things ever seen in New York." The part of the Georgian dandy exactly suited Mansfield. Earlier in the season *The Charity Ball*, another Belasco-de Mille play, had run for two hundred performances, and the Star Theatre, formerly Wallack's at Broadway and 13th Street, had opened with Bronson Howard's *Shenandoah*, produced earlier in Boston. This stirring Civil War play was a great hit. I remember how I stood in the gallery to see it, and when the curtain rose on the third act, and Effie Shannon, as Jenny Buckthorn, sounded the trumpet signal to her father's battalion, I thought I had witnessed the perfection of stage beauty. Perhaps I had. Notwithstanding all the brilliant acting, the *New York Herald* declared that "the present season" was "the most disastrous the profession has ever experienced." The theatre, of course, is always in ruins, but the *Herald* put its finger on the only possible cure. "The American plays have made the most money," it said. This was the lesson the managers had to learn. Yet it was only after three English plays had failed, that Palmer put on, in the next season (1890-1891) Augustus Thomas's *Alabama*, and gave another

American playwright his chance. If the death of Barrett in March, 1891, and the retirement of Edwin Booth, made 1891 an epochal year in the theatre, it was an even more important time in our dramatic progress. For after all, "the play's the thing" and when the American theatre is at a low ebb, it has always been a group of native playwrights who have brought it up again. It was Augustus Daly, William Gillette, Bronson Howard, Augustus Thomas, Clyde Fitch, James A. Herne, Edward Harrigan and Charles Hoyt who saved the American theatre.

All lovers of that theatre will rejoice to know that Dr. Odell is progressing with Volume xv, and hopes ultimately to reach the year 1900. The fourteen volumes now available are unique examples of first hand research, of unremitting industry and of artistic skill in presenting the fascinating picture of our stage from its inception.

A. H. QUINN

University of Pennsylvania

Contemporary Spanish Poetry: Selections from Ten Poets. Translated by ELEANOR L. TURNBULL. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1945. Pp. xiii + 401. \$3.50.

The Araucaniad: A version in English Poetry of Alonso de Ercilla y Zúñiga's "La Araucana." Translated by CHARLES MAXWELL LANCASTER and PAUL THOMAS MANCHESTER. Nashville, Tennessee: Vanderbilt University Press, 1945. Pp. 5-326. \$4.50.

A great deal of attention has been paid lately in this country to the literature of Latin American countries. Novel after novel has been prepared for classroom use, and translations of the most important works, including anthologies of poetry,¹ have appeared. Now, for the first time we have in *Contemporary Spanish Poetry* a synthetic panorama of the poetry of Spain in the last twenty five years. The contemporary poetic world of Spain comes to the English speaking people in a selection of ten of the most important poets. And this time we do not learn about them only through secondary sources, references, or criticism. There stand the poems in Spanish with an English translation which has been made with a great deal of skill, penetration, and fine sensibility. Poetry in general is very difficult to translate, modern poetry especially so, since one of its characteristics is the use of the language absolutely

¹ See for instance: Craig, G. Dundas, *The Modernist Trend in Spanish American Poetry*, Berkeley, U. of California Press, 1934; Fitts, Dudley, *Anthology of Contemporary Latin-American Poetry*, edited by Dudley Fitts, Norfolk, Conn., New Directions, 1942.

without rhetorical embellishments. At times, it becomes a play of abstractions or associations in which the imagination is lulled with vague impressions, or it may resort to the secret mysteries of an internal melody. The quest for the absolute tries to find expression in the exact phrase and the precise word. All this and much more is the poetry contained in the selection of ten Spanish poets. It is undoubtedly much more desirable to go to the primitive poem as it came out of the imagination of the poet for an exact appreciation of poetic tones. Nevertheless, a rendering into a foreign language, besides sometimes approaching the original feeling, may be a good guide for those who are initiated in the language but who do not master it completely. "Ten Spanish Poets" are ten different poetic worlds. Although it would be difficult to try to find a common denominator or an inclusive formula for all of them, we could speak of general trends. No matter how much Spanish poetry has been touched by the more subversive movements of the modern spirit, we can declare that on the whole there is an all-pervading feeling of freshness, an attitude of affirmation, a healthy approach to nature and the world, a plunge into the regions of the mysterious and the absolute, a refined and at the same time naïvely formal expression, and a sort of pantheistic ecstasy. There is very little pessimism, bitterness or frustration, which seem to be the dominant theme in other countries. The desperation of the modern world seems to have been sublimated in the lyricism of the poetic image. Even in poetry in which death is one of the recurrent thoughts, as is the case with that of García Lorca, the pure, fresh, and spontaneous expression of images is the most important consideration. There is also emphasis upon local color in some of the poets that might escape the foreign reader. Most of the poets in this selection were born or at least lived in Southern Spain, and the Andalusian and Mediterranean light is present in their poetry. Some of the themes and moods might also appear strange to a foreign sensibility. For this, we have to remember that Spain is a different culture, and that five or six centuries of Spanish poetry hang over the heads of our contemporary authors.

The second book is the translation of a long heroic poem of the sixteenth century. The poem, which has 21,072 lines, was written by don Alonso de Ercilla, a soldier of his Majesty Philip the Second who came with don García Hurtado de Mendoza to the far distant regions of Chile to help subdue these lands to the crown of Spain. There, the Spaniards met the opposition of a fairly small tribe of Indians, called the *Araucanos* (after *Arauco*, the region), who were extremely courageous, and who decided to fight to death for the preservation of their freedom. Ercilla started writing his poem in the midst of battle, and he himself confesses that sometimes he had to write even on the parchment of a drum or on scraps of paper because there was no other thing available. The poem is divided

into three parts which were published in Spain, the first in 1569, the second in 1578, and the third in 1589, with a span of twenty years between the first and the last. Although Ercilla presents us with the customs and ways of life of those tribesmen and gives us glimpses of the Chilean landscape, his main purpose is to depict the struggle of the Spaniards to overcome this unconquerable race. But the author, bewildered and amazed at the courage, valor, and high qualities of his enemies, switches his sympathies from the Spanish side to the Araucanian world and gives us what is primarily a poem of the *Araucanos*. Characters like Caupolicán are described with all the attributes of a magnificent hero. We have to wonder ourselves at the noble approach of a soldier who, having to fight his enemy with indomitable courage, is able to raise himself to a plane in which human understanding is at its best. This reminds us of those other *Romances Fronterizos* written in the Peninsula in the last stage of the *War of Reconquest* which generously and chivalrously exalted the valor and qualities of the enemy. The *Araucaniad*, although written by a Spaniard, is the first great literary monument of the New World, and it received from the author of *Don Quijote* the highest praise. It seems as if the literature of the American Continent needed an epic poem of its own to start on the road of culture and civilization. Chileans claim that the *Araucaniad* is their own poem. It remains for them an eternal tribute to their indigenous ancestors. The task of the translators has been a tremendous one. This is the first translation into English.² The text flows easily in trochaic tetrameters with an epic flavor and with close fidelity to the original.

These two books of translations contribute much to the understanding of the soul of Spain and Latin America which in the last analysis is one and indivisible. This is the kind of work which helps to destroy barriers for the attainment of a common understanding.

GUSTAVO CORREA

The Johns Hopkins University

Reading and Speaking Foreign Languages. By H. R. HUSE. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1945. Pp. viii + 128. \$2.00.

Indignant over reports spread by "college presidents" and "newspapers" that students of the Army ASTP program, "starting from scratch, learned to speak the most difficult tongues 'just like a native' in a few weeks," Mr. Huse has thought it wise to reconsider the question of language instruction in school and col-

² Translations had been made in French, German, and Dutch.

lege. To him the important thing is not to speak a foreign language, but to read its literature and to understand the form of civilization that it expresses. "Facility in speech," he holds, "is almost unrelated to serious intellectual powers" (p. 3), while "to eliminate study of foreign language and literature is to prescribe still more of the provincialism from which we suffer" (p. 58). Courses in foreign speech should be given, but not required. Authors of textbooks should devote their energies to teaching a student to read, without distracting his attention by trying to teach him to speak. Word-counts are quite unsatisfactory as their authors fail to realize that we speak less in isolated words than in phrases, that, as he puts it, "'To take the bull by the horns' . . . has nothing to do with actual bulls or horns" (p. 84). The problem with which he leaves us is "how best to present a definite list of material for memorizing" (p. 117).

Mr. H. does not seem to realize that there are students who remember better what they have heard than what they have read, and that there are few of them whose memories may not profit by being exposed to both methods. And how is a student to know where his ability lies unless he has been given such a trial? Moreover, to speak a foreign language well will bring to him intimate and instructive contacts that he will never derive from reading alone. Nor will we teachers return to the attitude of those linguistic scholars who, a generation or two ago, prided themselves on their inability to speak, like a *Sprachlehrer*, the modern language that they devoted their lives to investigating. The success of the ASTP can be reproduced if college students work as well as did the soldiers, and if they are given an equivalent amount of time by their instructors and can be taught in as small sections. It is after a period of such instruction that they may well be divided, in accordance with their tastes and abilities, into classes that will stress reading or speaking. This, at least, is my opinion, but I am glad to congratulate Mr. Huse on his frankness in setting forth the problems involved and on the pleasing manner in which he has written his booklet.

H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

BRIEF MENTION

Œuvres de Charles-Michel Campion, poète marseillais du dix-huitième siècle. Publiées pour la première fois, avec les illustrations de l'auteur, une introduction, des notices, des notes, une bibliographie et un index par EDWARD D. SEEGER et HENRY H. H.

REMAK. Indiana University Publications Humanities Series no. 11, 1945. Pp. 300. \$3.50. Charles-Michel Campion (1734-1784) was quite a versatile individual, particularly interested in painting and belles-lettres. To judge from the manuscript remains he was a fairly prolific writer. The manuscript used by Seeber and Remak includes a *Voyage d'Italie* in which prose and poetry are intermingled; a selection of poems; a play *Le Mari Sylphe* (a dramatic genre which Seeber has studied extensively in an article in *PMLA*, LIX (1944), 71-83); a descriptive-didactic poem *Le Loiret, ou la peinture en paysage*; a translation of Goldsmith's *Deserted Village* and of Thomas Percy's *Hermit of Warkworth, a Northumberland Ballad*; and finally a patriotic poem *L'Horloge détruite, ou la journée marseillaise*. If not all inclusive, this manuscript is fairly representative and shows to what extent Campion followed in the wake of the great writers of the time. He contributed nothing original in the domain of ideas or outstanding in the way of a literary masterpiece. He is a rather opaque reflector of eighteenth century enlightenment. After reading his works one wonders how he got elected to the Academy of Marseilles. The explanation for his election may be found in the fact that he was more talented with the brush than with the pen. The praise given him by his contemporaries and which the editors cite in their biographical introduction would lead to this conclusion. Seeber and Remak know their eighteenth century and have done an excellent piece of work in annotating the different pieces. They sin perhaps by explaining the obvious and by taking for granted that their reader's knowledge is very limited.

EMILE MALAKIS

A Concise Bibliography for Students of English. Systematically Arranged. By ARTHUR G. KENNEDY. Palo Alto, California: Stanford University Press, 1945. Pp. vii + 161. Paper. \$1.50. As our Alexandrian mania for heaping up learned matter becomes more and more chronic, the compiling of guides to these erudite Gobi Deserts becomes more and more necessary. The best cartographer so far has been Professor J. W. Spargo, but now Professor Kennedy, having tested his guide on his bibliography students, has put it in permanent form and will contend with Spargo for the laurel crown. Kennedy's handbook is arranged along lines similar to Spargo's but it differs in certain respects. Spargo lists some 1200 items; Kennedy has over 1800. In a sense one gets more titles, but one also get more perplexities. Spargo attempts to list essential books; Kennedy bows to personal preference and says "numerous books have been included because they have been found useful or enjoyable by one or other of us [the Stanford staff] during our years of study or teaching." I am not sure that this is a

good principle in a work that should be selective; it results, in this case, in the inclusion of titles that, frankly, should be forgotten by almost everyone. Spargo provides us with blank versos on which the names of additional books may be registered; Kennedy does not follow this practice, but suggests that the occasional blanks at the end of sections may be used in this way. I should find it difficult to transfer my additions on the history of printing from Spargo to Kennedy. Finally, Kennedy follows the chronological method of listing. In some works, this is the desired way to list, but in a work of this sort, the alphabetical arrangement is certainly handier. The chronological listing results, also, in difficulties when reprints, re-editions, and supplements are recorded.

D. C. A.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE MANUEL DES PÉCHÉS. The list of episcopal decrees showing the influence of Walter de Cantilupe's statute on materials of instruction, "The *Manuel des Péchés* and an English Episcopal Decree," *MLN*, LX (1945), 442-443, should be revised, tentatively, somewhat as follows: (1) 1240 Grosseteste (*Epistolae*, ed. Luard, p. 155; cf. Cheney, *English Synodalia*, p. 121); (2) 1240-1243 Norwich statutes (Wilkins, I, 731-732; Cheney, pp. 125-136); (3) 1241-1268 Ely statutes (Cheney, pp. 136-138); (4) 1258-1260 Walter de Kirkham of Durham (Wilkins, I, 704; Cheney, pp. 138-141); (5) 1262-1265 John Gervais of Winchester (*Reg. J. Pontisara*, Surrey Record Society IV, 1915, p. 237; Cheney, pp. 103-108); (6) 1287 Peter Quivil of Exeter (Wilkins, II, 143-144). The appearance of the new edition of the *Concilia* should considerably facilitate an evaluation of this decree and an estimate of its possible influence on the author of the *Manuel*.

D. W. ROBERTSON, JR.

MRS. GORDON SMYTHIES. To the list of her writings given in *MLN*, LX (1945), 359-64, should be added *The Constant Woman*, serialized in "Cassell's Illustrated Family Paper," 1859. I cannot find that this novel was reprinted in volume form. As stated on p. 363 of my article, *Left to Themselves* was published in 1863, but it had already been serialized as *Left to Themselves*; or, *Arab Life in London* in "Cassell's Illustrated Family Paper," commencing 31 December, 1859, and running on through 1860.

MONTAGUE SUMMERS

Richmond, Surrey,
England

THE OWLES ALMANACKE

EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION

By DON CAMERON ALLEN

This anonymous satire by one of Dekker's disciples is the best parody of the serious prognostication before Swift's assault on Partridge. Published in 1618, it surpasses the limits of its five English predecessors by burlesquing the almanac in all of its gaudy departments. The pseudo-scientific manner of the astrologers, their insistence on classical origins, their love of precise instruments, their engagements with the muses of verse, and their fuzzy jargon are all ludicrously mocked. The latter part of the work, in which a series of prognostications are made for the London Companies, goes beyond the scope of the professional prognostication to intrude upon the realm of "character-books." Besides its satirical and literary values, *The Owles Almanacke* is an interesting document for the student of Jacobean times. It contains allusions to the theatrical and literary activities of the day, accounts of the modes and manners of contemporary life, and a gallery of ordinary Londoners that are seldom encountered in works prior to Dickens'.

This satire has been edited from the three extant copies and provided with an introductory essay in which the editor attempts to supply a background for the reader by discussing the vogue of astrology and the history of the burlesque prognostication. To make the target of the satire less obscure, he has described a typical almanac and prognostication of the early seventeenth century.

Pp. vii + 103; 2 plates. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

HAZLITT IN THE WORKSHOP

THE MANUSCRIPT OF *THE FIGHT*

TRANSCRIBED,

WITH COLLATION, NOTES, AND COMMENTARY

By STEWART C. WILCOX

Although "The Fight" is one of William Hazlitt's most famous essays, not until now have his admirers been able to examine it in manuscript. The holograph is especially revealing because so few Hazlitt manuscripts have survived, and because it was written after he had finished his apprenticeship and grown into his true, familiar genius. In its original form, however, "The Fight" was almost two essays in one—the story of the great battle between Neate and Hickman interlarded with effusive digressions upon Sarah Walker, heroine of the *Liber Amoris*. Fortunately he expunged his sentimental digressions and so preserved the unified story and hearty mood of his masterpiece.

In *Hazlitt in the Workshop* the Morgan Library holograph is for the first time transcribed, and provided with collation and notes. In accompanying commentary the editor examines Hazlitt's writing habits in order to illuminate his methods of composition and revision, and his sense of structure and style. For this purpose four sources of information have been drawn upon: accounts of his writing habits by his friends and relatives, his own statements about his methods, the manuscript of "The Fight," and his other personal pieces. The conclusions should interest both admirers of Hazlitt and readers of the familiar essay.

Pp. xii + 94 pages. Cloth, \$1.50.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS • BALTIMORE

by Ramón del Valle-Inclán

❧ *Sonata de estío* ❧

For advanced high school and intermediate college classes. A colorful, romantic story which gives students an appreciation of the resources and charm of Spanish literature. Notes at the bottom of each page aid in translation. Vocabulary, *Cuestionario* to provide valuable oral work, and English introduction to the life and works of Valle-Inclán also included.

Edited by MARSHALL NUNN, Associate Professor of Spanish, University of Alabama, with the collaboration of BETTY VANN.

D. C. HEATH & COMPANY



¡Acaba de salir!

DON SEGUNDO SOMBRA

Gran novela gauchesca del notable escritor argentino Ricardo Güiraldes. Con introducción, notas, y vocabulario de Ethel Williams Plimpton y María L. Fernández. U. S. \$1.40

HOLT Y COMPAÑÍA • NEW YORK